

TOWARDS MULTIPLICITIES FOR CATEGORIES $\mathcal{O}$ OF CYCLOTOMIC CHEREDNIK ALGEBRAS

IVAN LOSEV

ABSTRACT. Varagnolo and Vasserot conjectured an equivalence between the category $\mathcal{O}$ for a cyclotomic Rational Cherednik algebra and a truncation of an affine parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ of type A. In this paper we reduce their conjecture to some purely combinatorial conjecture. Our principal tool for the reduction is the theory of categorical $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -actions on highest weight categories. Then we prove our combinatorial conjecture in some cases.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Combinatorics	3
2.1. Poset of multipartitions	3
2.2. Poset of parabolic highest weights	4
2.3. Crystal structures	5
2.4. Combinatorial conjecture	7
3. Categories $\mathcal{O}$	8
3.1. Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$	8
3.2. Parabolic affine categories $\mathcal{O}$	9
3.3. Rouquier and Varagnolo-Vasserot conjectures	9
3.4. Rouquier theory of highest weight equivalences	10
3.5. Categorifications	11
4. Highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications	12
4.1. Hierarchy structures	13
4.2. Highest weight categorical actions	14
4.3. Structural results about highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications	15
5. Truncated parabolic affine categorification	16
5.1. Categorification functors on $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(\leq n)$	16
5.2. $F^n \Delta(\emptyset)$	17
5.3. Checking (R1) and (R2)	18
6. 0-faithfulness from the combinatorial conjecture	18
6.1. Simple reflections and Ext's	18
6.2. Companion elements, representation theoretically	19
6.3. Completing the proof of 0-faithfulness	20
7. Proof of the combinatorial conjecture in the dominant case	21
7.1. Level 1	21
7.2. Weak conjecture in the dominant case	22
References	24

1. INTRODUCTION

Rational Cherednik algebras were introduced by Etingof and Ginzburg, [EG]. These are associative algebras over $\mathbb{C}$ constructed from a complex reflection group, say W , and depending on some parameters, say p . They have many things in common with the universal enveloping algebras of semisimple Lie algebras, in particular, they have a triangular decomposition. This allows to define the categories $\mathcal{O}$ for such algebras, this was done in [GGOR]. There are analogs of Verma modules, parameterized by irreducible W -modules, and an ordering on the set of simples in a Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$ making it into a highest weight category. So there is a basic question one can ask: compute the multiplicity of a given simple module in a given standard (=Verma) module.

The nicest and, perhaps, most important family of complex reflection groups is $W = G(\ell, 1, n) := S_n \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})^n$, where n, ℓ are positive integers. This group acts on $\mathbb{C}^n$ by permutations of coordinates followed by multiplications by ℓ th root of 1. There are more general infinite families, the groups $G(\ell, r, n)$, where r is a divisor of ℓ , but the study of the corresponding categories $\mathcal{O}$ can be, to some extent, reduced to the case of $G(\ell, 1, n)$ and this is one of the reasons why our case is important. The other reason is that the corresponding category has an additional interesting structure that is not present in the other cases, a categorical Kac-Moody action to be recalled below.

A significant progress in determining the multiplicities was made by Rouquier in [R1], where he determined the multiplicities in the case $\ell = 1$ and made a conjecture for all ℓ (the conjecture was made for some special, but, in a sense, the most interesting and “non-degenerate” values of p). The conjecture was that the multiplicities are given by certain parabolic Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials. We will recall the conjecture below. The techniques used in the proof for $\ell = 1$ were roughly as follows. In [GGOR] the authors introduced a so called KZ functor from the Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$ to the category of modules over the Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}$ of W with parameters recovered from p . This is a quotient functor. Rouquier developed techniques that allow to check when two highest weight categories admitting quotient functors to $\mathcal{H}$ -mod are equivalent. For $\ell = 1$ there is another category with a required quotient functor, the category of modules over an appropriate q -Schur algebra that was shown to be equivalent to the Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$.

For $\ell > 1$, the situation is more complicated. For certain, so to say, “dominant” and “faithful”, values of p Rouquier proved in *loc. cit.* that the Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$ is equivalent to the category of modules over a suitable cyclotomic q -Schur algebra of Dipper, James and Mathas. The multiplicities for the latter categories were recently computed by Stroppel and Webster, [SW].

On the other hand, Varagnolo and Vasserot in [VV] produced another category with required multiplicities. Their category is a certain truncation of an affine parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$. They conjectured an equivalence of that category with the Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$.

The goal of this paper is to deduce the Varagnolo-Vasserot conjecture (for “most non-degenerate” parameters satisfying a faithfulness condition) from a purely combinatorial conjecture involving an interplay between crystal and poset structures on the ℓ -multipartitions. Our conjecture comes in two forms, a weaker and a stronger. A weaker conjecture implies vanishing of Hom’s from certain simple modules to standard modules. A stronger version implies also vanishing of Ext^1 , and this is what we need for the Varagnolo-Vasserot conjecture. A principal new ingredient we are using to perform the reduction is that of highest

weight categorical $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -actions, see [L1],[L2]. We prove a stronger form of the combinatorial conjecture for $\ell = 1$ and a weaker form for the dominant parameters and arbitrary ℓ .

Let us also mention that, based on Rouquier's techniques, the author and I. Gordon proved an equivalence of the Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$ with a suitable *finite* parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ of type A under some degeneracy, faithfulness and dominance conditions on the parameter p . Using the techniques of the present paper one should be able to remove the dominance assumption.

Let us describe the content of the paper. In Section 2 we recall combinatorial structures on the sets of multipartitions and of affine parabolic weights: crystals and partial orders. Then we state our main combinatorial conjectures dealing with posets of multipartitions.

The next two sections contain a preliminary material. In Section 3 we introduce the categories whose equivalence we want to prove: the cyclotomic Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$ and Varagnolo-Vasserot's truncation of the affine parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$. We then recall the conjectures of Rouquier on the multiplicities and of Varagnolo and Vasserot on a category equivalence. Next, we recall Rouquier's approach to establishing category equivalences between highest weight covers and also categorical actions on the Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$ and the full affine parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$. In Section 4 we recall some results obtained in [L1],[L2].

The results of the next three sections are new. In Section 5 we study a truncated affine parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$. Using results of [L2], we define a "restricted" categorical action on that truncation. Thanks to results of Rouquier, [R2], this more or less automatically produces a quotient functor to the category of modules over a cyclotomic Hecke algebra needed in the Rouquier approach. In Section 6 we deduce the 0-faithfulness property of the quotient functor from the main combinatorial conjecture. Finally, the last section of the paper deals with the combinatorial conjecture itself. We prove it for $\ell = 1$, which is not very difficult. We also prove a weaker form of our conjecture for $\ell > 1$ for, so to say, very dominant values of a Cherednik parameter.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank R. Bezrukavnikov, J. Brundan, D. Gaitsgory, I. Gordon, P. Etingof, P. Shan, B. Webster for stimulating discussions.

2. COMBINATORICS

2.1. Poset of multipartitions. Let ℓ be a positive integer. We consider the set $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ of ℓ -multipartitions, i.e., ℓ -tuples $(\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(\ell)})$, where $\lambda^{(i)}$ is a partition. We write $|\lambda|$ for the number partitioned by λ .

A partition can be thought as a Young diagram – a shape on the coordinate plane consisting of unit square boxes. The diagram corresponding to a partition μ , by definition, consists of squares whose top right corner have coordinates (y, x) with $0 \leq y \leq \mu_x$. So a box in a multipartition λ is given by a triple (x, y, i) , where $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ is the number of a multipartition, where the box occurs, and (x, y) are its coordinates: x is the row number, and y is the column number.

We are going to equip $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ with a partial order. This partial order will depend on an integer $e > 1$ and an ℓ -tuple of integers (a multi-charge) $(s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$. To a box $b = (x, y, i)$ we assign its *shifted content* $\text{cont}(b) = y - x + s_i$.

We say that boxes b, b' are equivalent and write $b \sim b'$ if $\text{cont}(b) - \text{cont}(b')$ is divisible by e . Also to a box $b = (x, y, i)$ we assign the number $d(b) = -\frac{\ell}{e} \text{cont}(b) - i$. We write $b \preceq b'$ if $b \sim b'$ and $d(b) - d(b')$ is a non-negative integer. For two $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_\ell$ we write $\lambda \preceq \mu$ if $|\lambda| = |\mu|$ and we can number boxes $b_1, \dots, b_n$ of λ and $b'_1, \dots, b'_n$ of μ in such a way that $b_i \preceq b'_i$ for all i . It is not difficult to see that $\lambda \preceq \mu, \mu \preceq \lambda$ actually implies that $\lambda = \mu$.

2.2. Poset of parabolic highest weights. We fix integers $e > 1$ and $\mathbf{s} := (s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$ with $s_i \geq 0$. Set $m := s_1 + \dots + s_\ell$.

Let $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$ stand for the set of all m -tuples $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ of integers such that $a_1 > a_2 > \dots > a_{s_1}, a_{s_1+1} > \dots > a_{s_1+s_2}, \dots, a_{s_1+\dots+s_{\ell-1}+1} > \dots > a_m$. We are going to equip $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$ with two poset structures, one refining the other.

Our coarser poset structure comes from the linkage ordering on a parabolic affine category $\mathcal{O}$ to be considered later. Set $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_m$. Then we can form the affine algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g}[t^{\pm 1}] \oplus \mathbb{C}c$. Let $\mathfrak{h}$ denote the Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ consisting of the diagonal matrices and $\hat{\mathfrak{h}} := \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathbb{C}c$. Let $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_m$ be a natural basis of $\mathfrak{h}^*$ corresponding to the matrix units. Further, let δ denote the indecomposable positive imaginary root.

Let Q denote the affine root lattice of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$. The Weyl group of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$, that is, the affine symmetric group $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_m = \mathfrak{S}_m \ltimes Q$, where Q is the root lattice of $\mathfrak{g}$, acts naturally on $\mathbb{Z}^m$. In particular, for a real root $\alpha = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j + n\delta, i \neq j$, we have $s_\alpha(a_1, \dots, a_m) = (a'_1, \dots, a'_m)$, where $a'_k = a_k$ if $k \neq i, j$, $a'_i = a_j + en, a'_j = a_i - en$. Further, we say that an element $A = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ is $\mathbf{s}$ -regular if the numbers $a_1, \dots, a_{s_1}$ are pairwise different, the numbers $a_{s_1+1}, \dots, a_{s_1+s_2}$ are pairwise different, etc. For an $\mathbf{s}$ -regular element A let A_+ denote a unique element of $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$ that is obtained from A by applying a permutation from $\mathfrak{S}_{s_1} \times \mathfrak{S}_{s_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{S}_{s_\ell} \subset \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_m$. We say that $A > A'$ if there are elements $A_0 = A, A_1, \dots, A_{k-1}, A_k = A'$ such that $A_i = (s_{\beta_i} A_{i-1})_+$ for some real root β_i and $A_{i-1} - A_i$ is a nonzero linear combination of positive affine roots with nonzero coefficients. Below we will need an easy lemma describing some properties of this ordering.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$ and β be a positive real root, $\beta = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j + n\delta$, where $n \geq 0$ if $i < j$ and $n > 0$ if $i > j$. Suppose that $(s_\beta A)_+ < A$. Then $a_i - a_j - ne > 0$.*

Proof. For $A' \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $\alpha_{A'}$ be the element in the weight lattice of the extended affine algebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \hat{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathbb{C}\partial$ corresponding to A . More precisely, we set

$$\alpha_A := \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \epsilon_i - e\omega_0 + \frac{a_1^2 + a_2^2 + \dots + a_m^2}{2e} \delta,$$

where ω_0 is the fundamental weight corresponding to the simple root $\alpha_0 = \epsilon_m - \epsilon_0 + \delta$. We remark that $\alpha_{s_\beta A} = s_\beta \alpha_A$ and that $\alpha_{(s_\beta A)_+} = w \alpha_{s_\beta A}$, where w is some uniquely determined element in $\mathfrak{S}_{s_1} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{S}_{s_\ell}$. The inequality $(s_\beta A)_+ < A$ just means that $A - w s_\beta A$ is a combination of simple roots with non-negative integral coefficients (one of the coefficients should be strictly positive). We have $a_i - a_j - en = (\alpha_A, \beta)$.

Clearly, $\alpha_A - w s_\beta \alpha_A = (\alpha_A - s_\beta \alpha_A) + (s_\beta \alpha_A - w s_\beta \alpha_A)$. The second summand is a combination of the simple roots of the Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{gl}_{s_1} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{gl}_{s_\ell}$. But β does not lie in the span of those (otherwise $(s_\beta A)_+ = A$) So if $(s_\beta A)_+ < A$, then the coefficient of β in the first summand is positive, i.e., $a_i - a_j - en > 0$. $\square$

We are going to refine the ordering above. For this we will describe elements of $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$ in a different way – as *virtual multipartitions*.

We will represent an element A by the ℓ -tuples of diagrams of a certain form of that will be called *virtual Young diagrams*. Given a collection $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_{s_i}$ of integers consider the shapes consisting of all unit squares with coordinates (y, x) with $y \leq \mu_x$. Such a shape will be called a virtual Young diagram. Unlike a usual Young diagram, a virtual one is infinite to the left but still the rightmost positions of a box in a row increase from top to bottom.

Consider the element $A_\emptyset = (s_1, \dots, 1, s_2, \dots, 1, \dots, s_\ell, \dots, 1)$. We can view $A - A_\emptyset$ as a collection of ℓ virtual Young diagrams – a *virtual multi-partition*. So $\mathbb{Z}^s$ is in bijection with the set of all virtual multipartitions $(\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(\ell)})$ such that $\mu^{(i)}$ consists precisely of s_i rows.

Now we can introduce an ordering on $\mathbb{Z}^s$ similarly to the ordering on $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ from the previous subsection. Namely, given virtual multipartitions $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ we say that $\lambda \preceq \mu$ if we have orderings $(b_1, b_2, \dots)$ and $(b'_1, b'_2, \dots)$ of boxes in λ and μ , respectively, such that $b_i \leq b'_i$ for every i . We remark that there is an integer k such that the parts of λ, μ lying to the left of the k th column (in all ℓ diagrams) coincide. So we actually have $b_i = b'_i$ for all i but finitely many.

Lemma 2.2. *The partial order $\preceq$ refines $\leq$. That is, $\lambda \leq \mu$ implies $\lambda \preceq \mu$.*

Proof. We only need to prove that if $(s_\beta A)_+ < A$, then, for the corresponding virtual multipartitions λ and μ , we have $\lambda < \mu$. We can assign an ℓ -tuple of collections of boxes to any element of $\mathbb{Z}^m$ similarly to what was done above. Only for elements of $\mathbb{Z}^s$ these shapes will satisfy the condition that the lengths of the rows decrease from top to bottom. We also can define a relation on the set of these more general shapes but it will be a pre-order instead of a partial order.

We will first describe the shape corresponding to $s_\beta A$ and then explain how to get a virtual multipartition corresponding to $(s_\beta A)_+$ from that. We will see that the shape λ' corresponding to $s_\beta A$ is $\preceq \lambda$, while μ and λ' are equivalent with respect to the preorder $\preceq$.

Let $\beta = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j + n\delta$ and $A = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$. Then $s_\beta A = (a'_1, \dots, a'_m)$, where $a'_k = a_k$ if $k \neq i, j$, and $a'_i = a_j + ne$, $a'_j = a_i - ne$. So the virtual multipartition λ' corresponding to A' is obtained from A by modifying two rows – those corresponding to the indices i, j . Namely, we modify the row corresponding to i by removing $N := a_i - a_j - ne$ boxes from there (recall that, according to Lemma 2.1 $a_i - a_j - ne > 0$). And we modify the row corresponding to j by adding N boxes. Let us number the N added boxes, $b'_1, \dots, b'_N$, from left to right. Next, let us number the N removed boxes $b_1, \dots, b_N$, also from left to right. Then it is easy to check that $b'_i \preceq b_i$ for all i .

Now let us explain how to transform λ' to μ . If in a virtual Young diagram ν we have $\nu_i < \nu_{i+1}$ then we take the last $\nu_{i+1} - \nu_i - 1$ boxes in the $i + 1$ th row and move them to the i th row. We remark that under this procedure each box remains in the same diagonal it has been. We apply this procedure as many times as possible. This is precisely the way to get μ from λ' (if the shape that we get at the end is not a virtual Young diagram, then one cannot transform $s_\beta A$ into an element of $\mathbb{Z}^s$ by applying a permutation from $\mathfrak{S}_{s_1} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{S}_{s_\ell}$). The transformation does not change the equivalence class of a shape with respect to the preorder $\preceq$. So we have proved that $\mu \preceq \lambda$. $\square$

2.3. Crystal structures. In this subsection we will define certain $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -crystal structures: two, “dual” to each other, on $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ and one on $\mathbb{Z}^s$.

Recall that an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -crystal on a set Λ is a 5-tuple of maps $\tilde{e}, \tilde{f} : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda \sqcup \{0\}$ and $h_+, h_- : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\text{wt} : \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ with the following properties:

- (i) $\text{wt} = h_+ - h_-$.
- (ii) $\tilde{f}\lambda = 0$ if and only if $h_+(\lambda) = 0$. Similarly, $\tilde{e}\lambda = 0$ if and only if $h_-(\lambda) = 0$.
- (iii) For $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$ the equality $\tilde{e}\lambda = \lambda'$ is equivalent to $\tilde{f}\lambda' = \lambda$.
- (iv) If $\lambda' = \tilde{e}\lambda$, then $h_+(\lambda') = h_+(\lambda) + 1$, $h_-(\lambda') = h_-(\lambda) - 1$.

We remark that the functions $h_\pm, \text{wt}$ are uniquely recovered from $\tilde{e}, \tilde{f}$ and so below we do not mention them as a part of a crystal structure.

By an $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -crystal on Λ we will simply mean a collection $(\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i)_{i=0}^{e-1}$ of maps $\Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda \sqcup \{0\}$ such that $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$ form an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -crystal. Since we are just going to deal with three particular crystal structures we do not care about compatibility relations between the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -crystals for different i . We will often write $h_{i,-}, h_{i,+}$ for the functions h_-, h_+ defined for the residue i .

On the set $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ we will have two structures of $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -crystals. The first one, $(\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i)_{i=0}^{e-1}$ will be called the *usual* one, this is the structure provided by Uglov's dual canonical basis on the Fock space representation of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e)$ in the higher level Fock space corresponding to the multi-charge $\mathbf{s}$. This basis was defined in [U]. We will also have a *dual* structure $(\tilde{e}_i^*, \tilde{f}_i^*)$, we are not quite sure about the precise relationship between it and Uglov's work. To define $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{e}_i^*, \tilde{f}_i^*$ on $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_i$ we will need to recall the notion of the *i-signature* of λ that will be an ordered collection of $+$'s and $-$'s.

For a residue i modulo e we say that a box b is an *i-box* if $\text{cont}(b) - i$ is divisible by e . A box b lying in λ is *removable* if $\lambda \setminus b$ is still a multipartition. Similarly, a box b lying outside λ is *addable* for λ if $\lambda \sqcup b$ is still a multipartition. To get the *i-signature* of λ we list addable and removable *i*-boxes in λ in the increasing order with respect to $d(b) = -\frac{\ell}{e} \text{cont}(b) - j$, where $b \in \lambda^{(j)}$. In other words, a box b occurs to the left of b' in our list if either $\text{cont}(b) > \text{cont}(b')$ or $\text{cont}(b) = \text{cont}(b')$ but $j > j'$, where $b \in \lambda^{(j)}, b' \in \lambda^{(j')}$. The *i-signature* $t = (t_1, \dots, t_k)$ is obtained from this list by replacing an addable box with a $+$ and a removable box with a $-$.

We are going to introduce two reduction procedures for *i-signatures*. Consider the sets $I_\pm$ of indexes such j such that $t_j = \pm$. On each step we are going to remove a consecutive pair $-+$, i.e., to remove $j \in I_+, j' \in I_-$ if $j' < j$ and no elements between j and j' remain. We stop when no removal is possible. The terminal pair (I_+, I_-) (that is easily seen to be independent of the order of removals) is called the *reduced i-signature* of t (or of λ). It clearly has a property that all elements of I_+ are less than all elements of I_- . We will write $(I_+(t), I_-(t))$ for the reduced signature of t .

Or we can remove consecutive pairs $+-$, i.e., to remove $j \in I_+, j' \in I_-$ if $j' > j$ and there are no elements between j and j' left. In this way we will get the *dual reduced signature* $(I_+^*(t), I_-^*(t))$, it has a property that the elements of $I_+^*(t)$ are bigger than the elements of $I_-^*(t)$. For example, for $t = (+ + + - + + - - -)$ we have $I_+(t) = \{1, 2, 3, 6\}, I_-(t) = \{7, 8, 9\}, I_+^*(t) = \{1\}, I_-^*(t) = \emptyset$.

For the future use let us remark that we can partition elements of $\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus I_+(t) \setminus I_-(t)$ into pairs (we will call them *marked pairs*). For any marked pair $j < j'$ we have $t_j = -, t_{j'} = +$. Namely, we pair elements j, j' removed on each step. This partition also does not depend on the order of removals. For instance, in the example from the previous paragraph we pair 4 and 5. And if $t = (- + - - + +)$ we pair 1 to 2, 4 to 5, 3 to 6.

The maps $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{e}_i^*, \tilde{f}_i^*$ are defined as follows. The map $\tilde{f}_i$ adds an *i*-box in the position corresponding to the largest element of $I_+(t)$ if the latter is non-empty, or sends λ to 0 else. Similarly, $\tilde{e}_i$ removes the box corresponding to the minimal element of $I_-(t)$ or sends λ to 0 if the latter set is empty. The corresponding maps h_+, h_- are defined by $h_+(\lambda) = |I_+(t)|, h_-(\lambda) = |I_-(t)|$. Next, the map $\tilde{f}_i^*$ adds an *i*-box in the position corresponding to the minimal element of $I_+^*(t)$. The map $\tilde{e}_i^*$ removes the box in the position corresponding to the maximal element of $I_-^*(t)$.

In fact, the dual and the usual crystal structures are related via a duality. Namely, consider the multicharge $\mathbf{s}^\dagger = (-s_\ell, -s_{\ell-1}, \dots, -s_1)$. Let $\tilde{e}_i^\dagger, \tilde{f}_i^\dagger$ be the crystal operators on $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ associated to this multicharge. For a box $b = (x, y, i)$ consider a box $b^\dagger = (y, x, \ell + 1 - i)$. Also for a multipartition λ consider a multipartition $\lambda^\dagger := (\lambda^{(\ell)t}, \lambda^{(\ell-1)t}, \dots, \lambda^{(1)t})$, where the

superscript t means the usual transposition of Young diagrams. We have $b \prec_s b'$ if and only if $b'^\dagger \prec_{s^\dagger} b^\dagger$. So $\lambda \mapsto \lambda^\dagger$ is an order reversing bijection. Also we remark that the i -signature of λ is obtained from the $-i$ -signature of $\lambda^\dagger$ by reversing the order of elements. It follows $\tilde{e}_{-i}\lambda^\dagger = (\tilde{e}_i^*\lambda)^\dagger$ and $\tilde{f}_{-i}\lambda^\dagger = (\tilde{f}_i^*\lambda)^\dagger$.

We say that λ is *singular* if $\tilde{e}_i\lambda = 0$ for all i and *cosingular* if $\tilde{e}_i^*\lambda = 0$ for all i .

We would like to remark that the weight functions wt are the same for the usual and the dual crystal structure. We say that two multipartitions λ, μ lie in the same block if $|\lambda| = |\mu|$, and the e -tuples of their weight functions coincide (the e -tuple is referred to as the weight of a multipartitions). Equivalently, λ and μ lie in the same block if the number of i -boxes in λ equals the number of i -boxes in μ for any residue i .

Finally, let us define an $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -crystal structure on $\mathbb{Z}^s$. This is done absolutely analogously to the usual crystal structure above but we deal with virtual multi-partitions rather than with ordinary ones.

2.4. Combinatorial conjecture. Fix an element w in the affine symmetric group $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_e$ together with its reduced decomposition $w = s_{i_k} s_{i_{k-1}} \dots s_{i_1}$. For example, we will often consider cycles $w = s_{j'} s_{j'+1} \dots s_{j-1} s_j$.

For λ with $h_{i,-}(\lambda) = 0$ we define $s_i\lambda := \tilde{f}_i^{h_{i,+}(\lambda)}\lambda$. Otherwise we say that $s_i\lambda$ is undefined. So we can define an element $w\lambda$ (a priori, depending on the reduced decomposition of w) or say that this element is undefined. Recall that any two reduced decompositions are obtained from one another by applying braid moves, i.e., replacing a fragment $s_i s_{i+1} s_i$ with $s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, and vice versa. From here it is not difficult to see that $w\lambda$ depends only on w and not on the reduced expression. If λ is singular, then, as we will check rigorously below, $w\lambda$ is always defined.

Similarly, if μ is cosingular, we can define the element $w^*\mu$ by using the dual crystal operators f^* . We remark that if λ and μ are in the same block, then so are $w\lambda, w^*\mu$.

Here is a weaker version of our main combinatorial conjecture.

Conjecture 2.3. Let λ, μ be a singular and a cosingular multipartitions in the same block. Then there is $w \in \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_e$ such that $w\lambda \not\leq w^*\mu$.

In fact, to formulate a stronger conjecture, we will need to consider certain *companion* multi-partitions together with $w\lambda$.

Let $w = s_{i_k} \dots s_{i_1}$. First, let us define the companion elements of λ . For each residue i consider the i -signature t of λ . Recall that we have partitioned elements of $\{1, \dots, k\} \setminus I_+(t)$ (we remark that $I_-(t) = \emptyset$ because λ is singular) into pairs. By an i -companion of λ we mean any non-singular multipartition $\bar{\lambda}$ obtained from λ by moving a certain single box. Namely, there has to be a marked pair $p = \{j < j'\}$ in $\{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda \sqcup b' \setminus b$, where b, b' are the i -boxes corresponding to j and j' respectively. We will sometimes write $\lambda[p]$ for the multipartition produced from λ and the marked pair p . In particular, any i -companion of λ is less than λ . By a *companion* of λ we mean a multipartition that is an i -companion of λ for some residue i .

Now suppose that $\bar{\nu}^1, \dots, \bar{\nu}^m$ are the companions of $\nu := s_{i_q} \dots s_{i_1} \lambda$ and let $i := i_{q+1}$. The companions of $s_i\nu$ are determined as follows. If $h_{i,-}(\bar{\nu}^j) = 0$ and $\bar{\nu}^j$ cannot be obtained from ν by moving only i -boxes, then $s_i\bar{\nu}^j$ is a companion of $s_i\nu$. Also the multipartitions obtained by the following recipe are companions of $s_i\nu$. Let $j < j'$ be a marked pair in the i -signature t of $s_i\nu$. Then we can form a multipartition $s_i\nu[p]$ relative to the pair p similarly to the previous paragraph. By definition, all multipartitions that are obtained in this way and are

not of the form $s_{i_q} \dots s_{i_1} \lambda'$ for a singular λ' are also companions of $s_i \nu$ and all companions of $s_i \nu$ are obtained in one of these two ways.

It is unclear for us whether the companions of $w\lambda$ are independent of the choice of a reduced expression for w – their construction obviously does. In any case, here is a stronger version of our combinatorial conjecture.

Conjecture 2.4. Suppose that Conjecture 2.3 holds. Let λ, μ be a singular and a cosingular multipartitions in the same block. Also assume that $e > 1$ and all elements s_j are distinct modulo e . Then there is $w \in \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_e$ and a reduced expression $w = s_{i_k} s_{i_{k-1}} \dots s_{i_1}$ with the following property. Let ν be a companion of $w\lambda$ constructed from the reduced expression above. Then $\nu \not\leq w^* \mu$.

We will prove Conjecture 2.4 in an easy special case of $\ell = 1$. In fact, in our proof it will be enough to use a very special element w – a cycle $C_{j,n} = s_{j-n+1} \dots s_{j-1} s_j$.

3. CATEGORIES $\mathcal{O}$

3.1. Cherednik category $\mathcal{O}$. Let ℓ, n be positive integers. Consider the finite group $G_n := \mathfrak{S}_n \ltimes (\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})^n$. Let V be its reflection representation (of dimension n for $\ell > 1$ and of dimension $n - 1$ for $\ell = 1$). Let κ be a complex number and $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_\ell)$ be a collection of complex numbers defined up to a common summand. The rational Cherednik algebra $H_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ is the quotient of $T(V \oplus V^*) \rtimes G_n$ by the relations of the form $[x, x'] = 0, [y, y'] = 0, [y, x] = w_{x,y}$ for $x, x' \in V^*, y, y' \in V^*$, where $w_{x,y}$ is an element of $\mathbb{C}G_n$ depending linearly on x, y and (non-linearly) on the parameters $\kappa, s_1, \dots, s_\ell$. The reader is referred to, say [VV] for the particular form of the relations. What is important for us is that there is a triangular decomposition $H_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n) = S(V) \otimes \mathbb{C}G_n \otimes S(V^*)$.

We will consider the category $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ of $H_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ -modules introduced in [GGOR]. By definition, it consists of all $H_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ -modules that are finitely generated over $S(V^*)$ and where the action of $V \subset H_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ is locally nilpotent. This category has analogs of Verma modules: $\Delta(E) = H_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n) \otimes_{S(V) \rtimes G_n} E$, where E is an irreducible G_n -module. There is a natural identification of the set of irreducible G_n -modules with the set of ℓ -multipartitions of n . Our convention here is almost like in [GL] (with the index 0 replaced by ℓ). Consider the direct sum $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}} := \bigoplus_{n=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$. This is a highest weight category with poset $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ introduced in Subsection 2.1, the standard objects are $\Delta(\lambda)$. The claim that $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}$ is highest weight with respect to a finer (c-function) ordering was already in [GGOR]. The claim that the coarser ordering also works follows from [Gr], see also the proof of [DG, Theorem 1.2]. For reader's convenience let us recall the definition of a highest weight category.

An artinian abelian category $\mathcal{C}$ equipped with a collection of objects $\Delta(\lambda)$ indexed with elements of a poset Λ is said to be *highest weight* if the following axioms hold.

- (HW1) $\text{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta(\lambda)) = \mathbb{C}$.
- (HW2) There is a unique simple quotient $L(\lambda)$ of $\Delta(\lambda)$, and each simple in $\mathcal{C}$ is isomorphic to precisely one $L(\lambda)$.
- (HW3) For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there is a projective object $P(\lambda)$ equipped with a filtration $P(\lambda) = F_0 \supset F_1 \supset F_2 \dots$ such that $F_0/F_1 = \Delta(\lambda)$ and $F_i/F_{i+1} = \Delta(\lambda_i)$ with $\lambda_i > \lambda$ for all $i > 0$.
- (HW4) The BGG reciprocity holds: for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ the multiplicity of $L(\mu)$ inside $\Delta(\lambda)$ equals to the multiplicity of $\Delta(\lambda)$ inside $P(\mu)$.

To finish this subsection let us mention a one-parametric deformation of $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}$. Fix a generic $\ell + 1$ -tuple $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_\ell)$ of complex numbers with $x_1 + \dots + x_\ell = 0$. Then we can form the

algebra $H_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}(n)$ that is the quotient of $T(V \oplus V^*) \rtimes G_n[[\hbar]]$ by the relations corresponding to $\kappa + \hbar x_0, s_1 + \hbar x_1, \dots, s_\ell + \hbar x_\ell$. We can still define the category $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}$ in the same way as above. This is an integral (over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$) highest weight category in the sense of Rouquier, [R1, 4.1].

3.2. Parabolic affine categories $\mathcal{O}$. Let $m, e, \mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_\ell), \mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_m, \hat{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathfrak{h}, \hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ have the same meaning as in Subsection 2.2.

Further let $\mathfrak{p}$ be the parabolic subalgebra in $\mathfrak{g}$ that fixes the $\ell-1$ subspaces $\text{Span}(e_1, \dots, e_{s_1}), \text{Span}(e_1, \dots, e_{s_1+s_2}), \dots, \text{Span}(e_1, \dots, e_{s_1+\dots+s_{\ell-1}})$. Its Levi subalgebra is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{gl}_{s_1} \times \mathfrak{gl}_{s_2} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{gl}_{s_\ell}$. Let $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ stand for the parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ on level $-e$, whose objects are integrable over $\mathfrak{p} \oplus t\mathfrak{g}[t]$. See [VV, Section 2] for details.

The category $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ together with objects $\Delta(A), A \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$, becomes a highest weight category if we weaken (HW3) and allow the projective objects to lie in the pro-completion of this category. For a highest weight order on $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$ we can take the order $<$ from Subsection 2.2, see [VV, 5.1, 5.2].

We remark that if $\Delta(A), \Delta(A')$ lie in the same block of $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathfrak{p}}$, then the m -tuples of residues of $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and of $(a'_1, \dots, a'_m)$ modulo e differ by a permutation.

Multiplicities (of the simples in the standards) for $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ are known, they are given by some Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials, see [VV, Proposition 5.8]. We will return to this in the next subsection.

Also we will need a 1-parametric deformation of $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathfrak{p}}$, compare to the category $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}$ introduced in the previous subsection.

Let $\mathbf{x}$ be as above. Consider the algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \otimes \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$. Consider the category $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ consisting of all $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \otimes \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ -modules M satisfying the following conditions:

- the action of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \otimes \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ on M is $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ -linear,
- the level of M is $(x_0 \hbar - \frac{1}{e})^{-1}$,
- the action of $\mathfrak{p} \oplus t\mathfrak{g}[t]$ on M is locally finite,
- for any i , the element $\text{id}_i \in \mathfrak{gl}_{s_i} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ acts on M diagonalizably with eigenvalues in $\mathbb{Z} + \hbar x_i$.

3.3. Rouquier and Varagnolo-Vasserot conjectures. In [R1, 6.5] Rouquier made a conjecture on the multiplicities $[\Delta(\lambda) : L(\mu)]$ in the category $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}$ for $\kappa = -\frac{1}{e}$ and integral numbers $s_1, \dots, s_\ell$. Namely, to these data one can assign a $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e)$ -module $\mathcal{F}_q^{\mathbf{s}}$, a higher level Fock space with multi-charge $\mathbf{s}$, see [JMMO]. It has a standard basis indexed by $\mathcal{P}_\ell$. We can identify the complexified Grothendick group $[\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}]$ with the specialization $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{s}}$ at $q = 1$ by sending $[\Delta(\lambda)]$ to the standard basis element corresponding to λ . In [U] Uglov constructed canonical and dual canonical bases of this space. These are again parameterized by multi-partitions. Rouquier's conjecture can be stated in the following way.

Conjecture 3.1 (Rouquier). Let $\kappa = -\frac{1}{e}$ and $s_1, \dots, s_\ell$ be integers. Under the identification of $[\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}]$ with $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{s}}$, the class $[L(\mu)]$ equals the dual canonical basis element corresponding to μ .

Varagnolo and Vasserot in [VV] upgraded this conjecture to the categorical level. Namely, the Fock space is graded, $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{s}} = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{+\infty} \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{s}}(n)$, in such a way that $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{s}}(n) = [\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)]$. The (dual) canonical basis is compatible with this grading. Varagnolo and Vasserot presented another highest weight category $\mathcal{C}$ with $[\mathcal{C}] = \mathcal{F}^{\mathbf{s}}(n)$ such that the classes of simples are dual canonical basis elements. This category is obtained from an appropriate affine parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ by a truncation. Let us explain the construction.

For a non-negative integer n that is less than all $s_1, \dots, s_\ell$ we are going to define a truncated subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(\leq n) \subset \mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$. Recall that in Subsection 2.2 we have identified the highest weight poset $\mathbb{Z}^s$ of $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$ with the set of virtual ℓ -multipartitions $(\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(\ell)})$, where $\lambda^{(i)}$ has s_i rows. We can embed the set $\mathcal{P}_\ell(n)$ into $\mathbb{Z}^s$ as follows. To a multipartition $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(\ell)})$ we assign a virtual multipartition $\tilde{\lambda} = (\tilde{\lambda}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}^{(\ell)})$ in the following way: the columns of $\lambda^{(i)}$ with positive numbers are the same as of $\tilde{\lambda}^{(i)}$, while the columns with non-positive numbers consist of precisely s_i elements. Since $n < s_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, this map is well defined. Below we will always view $\mathcal{P}_\ell(n)$ as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^s$ in this way. Set $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq n) = \bigsqcup_{m \leq n} \mathcal{P}_\ell(m)$. By [VV, Proposition A6.1], if $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq n)$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ is less than λ (in the linkage order recalled in Subsection 2.2), then $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq n)$ too.

Consider the Serre subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(\leq n)$ of $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$ generated by $L(\lambda), \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq n)$. From the result quoted in the end of the previous paragraph, it follows that $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(\leq n)$ is a highest weight subcategory of $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$ with standard objects $\Delta(\lambda), \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq n)$. We have a natural direct sum decomposition $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(\leq n) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^n \mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(j)$.

The following conjecture of Varagnolo and Vasserot, [VV, 8.8], implies Conjecture 3.1.

Conjecture 3.2. Assume that $n > s_i$ for any i . Then there is a highest weight equivalence $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ preserving the labels of standard objects.

We will see that our combinatorial Conjecture 2.4 implies Conjecture 3.2 (with the restriction on $e, s_1, \dots, s_\ell$ imposed in the former) but only if all s_i are sufficiently big (we remark that $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ depends only on the pairwise differences between the s_i 's). It should be possible to prove that the category $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(n)$ also depends only on the pairwise differences between the s_i 's as long as $s_i > n$ for all i .

3.4. Rouquier theory of highest weight equivalences. Conjecture 3.2 is known in one special case, when $\ell = 1$. In this case $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{g}$ and the category $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$ is the so called Kazhdan-Lusztig category. The truncated category $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(n)$ is known to be equivalent to the category of modules over the q -Schur algebra. As Rouquier proved in [R1, Section 6], the latter is equivalent to $\mathcal{O}_\kappa(n)$, at least when $e > 2$.

To prove this theorem Rouquier established some relatively general technique to check that two highest weight categories are equivalent. It requires checking certain conditions. These conditions are known to hold for $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ but whether they hold on the affine side is unknown. We are going to recall Rouquier's technique (in a special case we need) now.

First, we need to recall the definition of a cyclotomic Hecke algebra. Consider the affine Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_q(j)$ that is generated by elements $T_1, \dots, T_{j-1}, X_1$ subject to the relations

$$(T_i + 1)(T_i - q^2) = 0, T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1}, T_i T_j = T_j T_i, |i - j| > 1, \\ T_1 X_1 T_1 X_1 = X_1 T_1 X_1 T_1, X_1 T_i = T_i X_1, i > 1,$$

where, as before, $q = \exp(\pi\sqrt{-1}/e)$. We will consider the cyclotomic quotient $\mathcal{H}_q^s(j)$ of $\mathcal{H}_q(j)$ by $\prod_{j=1}^\ell (X_1 - q^{2s_i})$. Also we consider the one-parameter deformation $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_q^s(j)$ of $\mathcal{H}_q^s(j)$ that is an algebra over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$. Namely, we impose relations $(T_i + 1)(T_i - \tilde{q}^2), \prod_{j=1}^\ell (X_1 - \tilde{q}^{2\tilde{s}_i})$, where $\tilde{q} = \exp(\pi(\sqrt{-1}/e + \hbar x_0))$, $\tilde{s}_i = s_i + \hbar x_i, i = 1, \dots, \ell$, where $x_0, \dots, x_\ell$ are such as in Subsection 3.1, and leave all other relations unchanged. It is known that the localization $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_q^s(j)[\hbar^{-1}]$ is a split semisimple algebra over $\mathbb{C}[\hbar^{-1}, \hbar]$, see [AK].

Now suppose $\mathcal{C}_\hbar^1, \mathcal{C}_\hbar^2$ are two highest weight categories integral over $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$, corresponding to posets Λ^1, Λ^2 . Suppose, further, there are quotient functors $\pi_\hbar^i : \mathcal{C}_\hbar^i \rightarrow \text{mod-}\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_q^s(j)$. Finally, suppose that the following three assumptions are satisfied.

- (R1) The functors π_h^i become equivalences after localizing $\hbar$. This induces a bijection $\Lambda^1 \cong \Lambda^2$ (because both $\mathcal{C}_h^1[\hbar^{-1}], \mathcal{C}_h^2[\hbar^{-1}]$ are split semisimple categories – whose simples are necessarily the localizations of standards – and $(\pi_h^1[\hbar^{-1}])^{-1} \circ \pi_h^2[\hbar^{-1}]$ is their equivalence).
- (R2) If we identify Λ^1 and Λ^2 using this bijection, then one of the orderings refines the other.
- (R3) The specialization π^i of π_h^i at $\hbar = 0$ is fully faithful on standardly filtered objects for both $i = 1, 2$: if M, N are standardly filtered objects in $\mathcal{C}^i$, then the natural map $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^i}(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_s^q(j)}(\pi^i(M), \pi^i(N))$ is a bijection.

Then there is a highest weight equivalence $\mathcal{C}_h^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_h^2$ intertwining the functors π_h^1, π_h^2 . Therefore there is also a highest weight equivalence $\mathcal{C}^1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^2$.

This is a technique that we are going to use to establish an equivalence in Conjecture 3.2. For $\mathcal{C}_h^1$ we will take the subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}}(n) \subset \mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}}$ corresponding to the sub-poset $\mathcal{P}_\ell(n) \subset \mathbb{Z}^s$ (similarly to $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}(n) \subset \mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$). For $\mathcal{C}_h^2$ we take the category $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}(n)$, see Subsection 3.1.

It is known how to construct the functor π_h^2 and when it has property (P3). For π_h^1 we can take the KZ functor from [GGOR]. It satisfies (R3) exactly when $e > 2$ and all $s_i, i = 1, \dots, \ell$, are distinct modulo e .

A construction of π_h^1 was essentially suggested in [VV] but none of the properties we need was checked there. We will relate π_h^i to type A categorifications in the next subsection.

3.5. Categorifications. First let us recall the notion of a type A categorical action (=categorification), essentially due to Chuang and Rouquier, [CR], see also [R2, 5.3.8].

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an artinian abelian $\mathbb{C}$ -linear category. Then by a type A categorification on $\mathcal{C}$ one means a pair of biadjoint functors E, F with fixed one-sided adjointness morphisms $\text{Id} \rightarrow EF, FE \rightarrow \text{Id}$ and also functor morphisms $X \in \text{End}(F), T \in \text{End}(F^2)$ that are subject to Hecke relations (where 1_E stands for the identity transformation of E and q is a non-zero element of $\mathbb{C}$):

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.1) \quad & (T + 1_{E^2})(T - q^2 1_{E^2}) = 0, \\
 & T(1_E X)T = q^2 X 1_E, \\
 & (T 1_E)(1_E T)(T 1_E) = (1_E T)(T 1_E)(1_E T).
 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can define a type A categorification on a $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ -linear category (q is now required to be an invertible element of $\mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$).

We proceed by recalling type A categorifications on the categories $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}}$.

A categorification on $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}$ was essentially introduced by Shan, [S]. The functors F, E on the direct summand $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}(n)$ are Bezrukavnikov-Etingof induction (from G_n to G_{n+1}) and restriction (from G_n to G_{n-1}) functors, [BE]. The transformations X and T are defined using the KZ functor from [GGOR]. The reader is referred to [S] for details. In particular, this description shows that the object $F^n \Delta(\emptyset)$ is projective and realizes the KZ functor $\pi_h^2 : \mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}(n) \rightarrow \text{mod-}\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_s^q(n)$ as $\text{Hom}(F^n \Delta(\emptyset), \bullet)$ (the latter algebra is a cyclotomic Hecke algebra).

Now let us explain how to equip $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}}$ with a type A categorification.

Namely, consider the Kazhdan-Lusztig category $\mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathbf{g}}$ that is a special case of the category $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}}$. For a finitely dimensional GL_m -module L let $M(L), \tilde{M}(L)$ denote the corresponding Weyl module in $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{g}}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathbf{g}}$, of course, $M(L)$ is a specialization of $\tilde{M}(L)$. Also recall the duality functor D on $\mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathbf{g}}$. It sends $\tilde{M}(L)$ to $\tilde{M}(L^*)$.

For two modules in $\mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ we can take their Kazhdan-Lusztig tensor product $\dot{\otimes}$. To define this tensor product we need to fix some points in $\mathbb{P}^1$ but the result is independent of this choice up to an isomorphism. The bifunctor $\dot{\otimes}$ turns $\mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ into a braided monoidal category, whose unit object is $\tilde{M}(\mathbb{C})$, where $\mathbb{C}$ is the trivial GL_n -module.

Also for $M \in \mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $N \in \mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ we can define their product $N \dot{\otimes} M$ (with the same remark about dependence on the choice of some points as before). The $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} \otimes \mathbb{C}[[\hbar]]$ -module $N \dot{\otimes} M$ is still in $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}$. This defines a right biexact bifunctor $\mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathfrak{g}} \times \mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ that turns $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ into a module category over $\mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Now suppose that N is a standardly filtered object in $\mathcal{O}_{-e, x_0}^{\mathfrak{g}}$. Then the endofunctor $N \dot{\otimes} \bullet$ of $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ is exact, and biadjoint to $D(N) \dot{\otimes} \bullet$, see [VV, Corollary 7.3].

We will be interested in the case when $N = \tilde{M}(\mathbb{C}^m)$. We denote the functor $\tilde{M}(\mathbb{C}^m) \dot{\otimes} \bullet$ by F and the biadjoint functor $\tilde{M}(\mathbb{C}^{m*}) \dot{\otimes} \bullet$ by E . There are distinguished elements $X \in \mathrm{End}(F)$ and $T \in \mathrm{End}(F^2)$. They are given by monodromy. Namely, recall that to define F we need to fix 3 points: say $0, z, \infty$, where we put the modules $\tilde{M} \in \mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}$, $\tilde{M}(\mathbb{C}^m)$ and the resulting module $\tilde{M}(\mathbb{C}^m) \dot{\otimes}_z M$, respectively, where the subscript “ z ” indicates the dependence on z . Then we get a local system over $\mathbb{C}^\times$ with fiber $M(\mathbb{C}^m) \dot{\otimes}_z M$ over z . The corresponding connection is the $n = 1$ special case of the KZ connection: $\frac{d}{dz} - \frac{\Omega}{z}$, where Ω is the tensor Casimir, $\Omega = \sum_{i,j=1}^n E_{ij} \otimes E_{ji}$, where E_{ij} denote the matrix unit on the position (i, j) . See, for example, [EFK]. The monodromy of this local system around 0 gives us the transformation X we want. Similarly, to define F^2 , we need to choose two points $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. The transformation T is defined similarly to X using the monodromy of z_2 around z_1 (in fact, we need to multiply this transformation T by q). It follows from the construction that X and T satisfy the braid relation. Also the Kazhdan-Lusztig theory implies that T satisfies the Hecke relation: $(T + 1)(T - q^2) = 0$, where $q = \exp(\pi\sqrt{-1}/e)$. Also $T_2 := T1_F$ and $T_1 := 1_F T$ satisfy the braid relation. The biadjoint functors E, F together with $X \in \mathrm{End}(F), T \in \mathrm{End}(F^2)$ define a type A categorification on $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}$.

The same results hold true when $\hbar$ is specialized to 0. In fact, they were proved in [VV] in that setting but a generalization to the deformed setting is straightforward.

Varagnolo and Vasserot proposed to consider the functor $\mathrm{Hom}(F^n \Delta(\emptyset), \bullet)$ from $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathfrak{p}}(n)$ to $\mathrm{mod}\text{-}\mathrm{End}(F^n \Delta(\emptyset))$. They observed that there is a natural homomorphism from $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^q(n)$ to $\mathrm{End}(F^n \Delta(\emptyset))$ (we will recall why below). But, a priori, it is not clear why this homomorphism is an isomorphism. Also it is unclear whether $F^n \Delta(\emptyset)$ is projective in the truncated category (definitely, it is not projective in the whole parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$). We will check that $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathfrak{s}}^q(n) \cong \mathrm{End}(F^n \Delta(\emptyset))$ and that $F^n \Delta(\emptyset)$ is projective in section 5. Proofs of both claims, see Section 5, will be based on the categorical splitting for highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications discovered in [L2].

With this checking (R1) and (R2) is easy and will be done in Section 5. Checking (R3) seems to be much harder. Modulo Conjecture 2.4, this will be done in Section 6. Again, we will heavily rely on results from [L2].

4. HIGHEST WEIGHT $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -CATEGORIFICATIONS

The goal of this section will be to recall certain constructions and results from [L2], as they will be extensively used in the sequel.

¹What is the sign here?

4.1. Hierarchy structures. Fix a residue $i \bmod e$. We start by equipping the poset $\mathbb{Z}^s$ of $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p$ with a hierarchy structure, see [L2, Section 3].

The first ingredient of a hierarchy structure as defined in [L2, Subsection 3.1] is a family structure that is a partition of a poset $\Lambda := \mathbb{Z}^s$ into *families* Λ_a for a in some indexing set $\mathfrak{A}$ together with bijections $\sigma_a : \{+, -\}^{n_a} \rightarrow \Lambda_a$. Here the inverse σ_a^{-1} has to be increasing, where we equip the set $\{+, -\}^{n_a}$ with a poset structure by setting $(t_1, \dots, t_{n_a}) \preceq (t'_1, \dots, t'_{n_a})$ if the number of $-$'s among $t_1, \dots, t_k$ does not exceed that for $t'_1, \dots, t'_k$ for any k , while the total number of $-$'s is the same.

By definition, two virtual multipartitions λ, μ lie in the same family if they can be obtained from a single virtual multipartition ν by adding i -boxes. For $\lambda \in \Lambda_a$ define a tuple $\sigma_a^{-1}(\lambda)$ as follows. Number all addable and removable i -boxes b in the increasing order with respect to the number $d(b)$ used in Subsection 2.1. For each such box b we write a $+$ if it is addable and a $-$ if it is removable. This collection of $+$'s and $-$'s is, by definition, $\sigma_a^{-1}(\lambda)$ (and so n_a is the number of addable/removable i -boxes in λ). It is clear that σ_a^{-1} is increasing with respect to the order $\preceq$ on Λ_a and $\preceq$ on $\{+, -\}^{n_a}$.

Let us define now the second component of a hierarchy structure – a splitting structure. Namely, to a family Λ_a we need to assign a splitting $\Lambda = \Lambda_{>}^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_+^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_-^a \sqcup \Lambda_{<}^a$ subject to certain axioms (S0)-(S4) from [L2, 3.1]. These axioms are the following.

- (S0) For each a we have $\Lambda_{<}^a \not\supset \underline{\Lambda}_-^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_+^a \sqcup \Lambda_{>}^a$, $\underline{\Lambda}_-^a \not\supset \underline{\Lambda}_+^a \sqcup \Lambda_{>}^a$, $\underline{\Lambda}_+^a \not\supset \Lambda_{>}^a$, where for disjoint subsets $X, Y \subset \Lambda$ we write $X \not\supset Y$ if there are no $x \in X, y \in Y$ with $y < x$.
- (S1) $n_a = 0$ if and only if $\underline{\Lambda}_-^a, \underline{\Lambda}_+^a = \emptyset$.
- (S2) For each a, b the family Λ_b is contained either in $\Lambda_{<}^a$ or in $\Lambda_{>}^a$ or in $\Lambda_{=}^a := \underline{\Lambda}_-^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_+^a$. Moreover, suppose $\Lambda_b \subset \Lambda_{=}^a$. An element $\lambda \in \Lambda_b$ is contained in $\underline{\Lambda}_?^a$ if and only if the rightmost element of $\sigma_b^{-1}(\lambda)$ is $?$ (for $? = +, -$).
- (S3) Let $a, b \in \mathfrak{A}$. If $\Lambda_b \subset \Lambda_{=}^a$, then $\underline{\Lambda}_?^b = \underline{\Lambda}_?^a$ for $? = +, -$. The inclusion $\Lambda_b \subset \Lambda_{>}^a$ holds if and only if $\Lambda_a \subset \Lambda_{<}^b$.
- (S4) Let $a \in A$. Then there is a (automatically, unique) poset isomorphism $\iota : \underline{\Lambda}_-^a \rightarrow \underline{\Lambda}_+^a$ that maps $\underline{\Lambda}_-^a \cap \Lambda_b$ to $\underline{\Lambda}_+^a \cap \Lambda_b$ such that if $\sigma_b^{-1}(\lambda) = t-$ for $t \in \{+, -\}^{n_b-1}$, then $\sigma_b^{-1}(\iota(\lambda)) = t+$.

Let us now describe the four subsets $\Lambda_{>}^a, \Lambda_{<}^a, \underline{\Lambda}_+^a, \underline{\Lambda}_-^a$ in the case of interest. Let $b = (x, y, i)$ be the common largest addable/removable box for the multipartitions in Λ_a . For a multipartition λ and a box b' let $|\lambda|^{b'}$ denote the number of boxes $b'' \in \lambda$ with $b'' \sim b', d(b'') = d(b')$. For all boxes b' with $b' \not\sim b$ or with $b' \sim b, b' < b$ the numbers $|\lambda|^{b'}$ do not depend on the choice of $\lambda \in \Lambda_a$. We remark that for $\lambda \in \Lambda_a$ the number $|\lambda|^b$ takes one of the two consecutive values, say $s, s+1$. Let $\underline{b}$ be the box just below b (existing if $x \neq 1$).

Let $\Lambda_{>}^a$ consist of all multipartitions μ such that one of the following conditions hold

- (i) There is a box b' such that $d(b') > d(b)$ and we have $|\lambda|^{b''} = |\mu|^{b''}$ if $d(b'') > d(b)$ and $|\lambda|^{b'} > |\mu|^{b'}$.
- (ii) We have $|\lambda|^{b'} = |\mu|^{b'}$ as long as $d(b') > d(b)$, while $|\mu|^b < s$.
- (iii) We have $|\lambda|^{b'} = |\mu|^{b'}$ whenever $d(b') > d(b)$, as well as $|\mu|^b = s$. But there is a box $\underline{b}' \leq \underline{b}$ such that $|\lambda|^{\underline{b}''} = |\mu|^{\underline{b}''}$ for any $\underline{b}'' < \underline{b}'$ and $|\mu|^{\underline{b}'} < |\lambda|^{\underline{b}'}$.

Let $\underline{\Lambda}_+^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_-^a$ consist of all multipartitions μ such that $|\mu|^b = s$ or $s+1$, and $|\mu|^{b'} = |\lambda|^{b'}$ for all b' such that either $d(b') < d(b)$ or $b' \leq \underline{b}$. Then automatically b is an addable/removable box in any $\mu \in \underline{\Lambda}_+^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_-^a$ and we form the subsets $\underline{\Lambda}_+^a, \underline{\Lambda}_-^a$ accordingly. Finally, let $\Lambda_{<}^a$ consist of the remaining partitions. The proof that (S0)-(S4) hold is completely parallel to that given in [L2]. We remark however, that our definition of the subsets is different from [L2].

The structure that we need to add to family and splitting structures to get a hierarchy structure is a family of subset $\mathfrak{A}' \subset \mathfrak{A}$ together with posets $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A}')$ possessing both family and splitting structures. The initial indexing set $\mathfrak{A}$ is one of the subset and the corresponding poset is $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A})$. Furthermore the following axioms (H0)-(H2) from [L2, Subsection 3.1] have to hold.

- (H0) two different subsets in $\mathfrak{H}$ are either disjoint or one is contained in another.
- (H1) Let $\mathfrak{A}' \subset \mathfrak{A}''$ be elements of $\mathfrak{H}$. Then there is a finite chain of subsets $\mathfrak{A}_0 \subset \mathfrak{A}_1 \subset \dots \subset \mathfrak{A}_k$ from $\mathfrak{H}$ with $\mathfrak{A}' = \mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}'' = \mathfrak{A}_k$ subject to the following condition: for any $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ there is $a_i \in \mathfrak{A}_{i+1}$ such that $\mathfrak{A}_i = \underline{\mathfrak{A}}_{i+1}^{a_i}$ and $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A}_i) = \underline{\Lambda}(\mathfrak{A}_{i+1})^{a_i}$ as posets with family structures.
- (H2) Any descending chain of embedded subsets in $\mathfrak{H}$ terminates.

Essentially, this means that the pairs $(\mathfrak{A}', \Lambda(\mathfrak{A}'))$ are obtained using the following inductive procedure. Fix some $a \in \mathfrak{A}_1$. Then $\mathfrak{A}_1^a$ is the set indexing families of $\underline{\Lambda}^a$ and $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A}_1^a) = \underline{\Lambda}(\mathfrak{A}_1)^a$, where we *freeze* the smallest currently unfrozen addable/removable box (so that it is not counted when we produce the family and the splitting structures on $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A}_1^a)$). All pairs $(\mathfrak{A}', \Lambda(\mathfrak{A}'))$ are obtained in several steps from $(\mathfrak{A}, \Lambda)$.

4.2. Highest weight categorical actions. In fact, the categorification functors E, F on $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}, \mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}}$ are nicely compatible with standardly filtered objects. Consider $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{p}}$ first.

Choose $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$ and represent A as an m -tuple of integers. According to [VV, Lemma A2.10], the object $F\Delta(A)$ has a filtration whose successive subquotients are $\Delta(A^i)$, with $A^i := A + \epsilon_i$, where i is any index with $A_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathbf{s}}$. From the description of X given in Subsection 3.5 it follows that X preserves the filtration (this follows from the ordering considerations) and acts on the subquotient $\Delta(A^i)$ by $\exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}(a_i + x_i\hbar)(x_0\hbar - 1/e))$.

In particular, if we specialize $\hbar = 0$ we will see that all eigenvalues of X on $F\Delta(A)$ are e th roots of 1. Let $F = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/e\mathbb{Z}} F_i$, where F_i is the endofunctor of F corresponding to the eigenvalue $\exp(-2\pi\sqrt{-1}i/e)$. Then on the level of virtual multipartitions the standard quotients of $F_i\Delta(\lambda)$ correspond to all multipartitions obtained from λ by adding an i -box. Let E_i denote the left adjoint functor of F_i , a direct summand of E . These functors constitute an $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -categorification on $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$ in the sense of Rouquier, [R2, 5.3.7].

Together with the considerations of Subsection 4.1, this means that the functors $E := F_i, F := E_i$ define a highest weight categorical $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_2$ -action (with respect to the hierarchy structure defined in Subsection 4.1) on the category $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$ (modulo the difference that the projectives lie not in the category but rather in its pro-completion, but this difference actually does not matter). By definition, a highest weight categorification is a highest weight category $\mathcal{C}$ with a highest weight poset Λ equipped with a hierarchy structure, and with an $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_2$ -categorification, where the highest weight and the categorification structures are related via the following two axioms, see [L2, 4.1]:

- (i) $E\Delta(\lambda)$ admits a filtration whose successive quotients are $\Delta(\lambda^1), \dots, \Delta(\lambda^k)$, where the elements $\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^k$ are determined as follows. Set $t = \sigma_a^{-1}(\lambda)$ and let $j_1 > j_2 > \dots > j_k$ be all indexes such that $t_{j_i} = +$. Then $\lambda^i := \sigma_a(t^i)$, where t^i is obtained from t by replacing the j_i -th element with a $-$.
- (ii) $F\Delta(\lambda)$ admits a filtration whose successive quotients are $\Delta(\bar{\lambda}^1), \dots, \Delta(\bar{\lambda}^l)$, where the elements $\bar{\lambda}^1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}^l$ are determined as follows. Set $t = \sigma_a^{-1}(\lambda)$ and let $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_l$ be all indexes such that $t_{j_i} = -$. Then $\bar{\lambda}^i := \sigma_a(\bar{t}^i)$, where $\bar{t}^i$ is obtained from t by replacing the j_i -th element with a $-$.

Recall that we work over $\mathbb{C}$, which is an uncountable field, so we do not need to impose any other assumptions, see [L2, 4.1].

Now consider the category $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}}$. Arguing similarly to [S], we see that the object $F\Delta(\lambda)$ in this category has a filtration whose successive quotients are of the form $\Delta(\lambda^j)$, where λ^j are all multipartitions obtained from λ by adding a box. The transformation X acts on the quotient $\Delta(\lambda^i)$ by $\exp(2\pi\sqrt{-1}(\text{cont}(\lambda^j \setminus \lambda) + x_i\hbar)(x_0\hbar - 1/e))$.

Specializing $\hbar = 0$, we get the $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -categorification on $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}$ constructed by Shan, [S]. As we have seen in [L2], each pair (F_i, E_i) produces a highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification on $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}$.

4.3. Structural results about highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification with respect to a hierarchy structure on a poset Λ as defined in [L2]. Let E, F denote the categorification functors.

The splitting structure that is a part of a hierarchy structure has a categorical counterpart defined and studied in [L2, Section 5]. Namely, pick an index a and consider the splitting $\Lambda = \Lambda_{<}^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_+^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_-^a \sqcup \Lambda_{>}^a$. We have a highest weight subquotient $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{a}}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ defined as follows. Pick a subset $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ with the property that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda'$ implies $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda'$. Then we can define the Serre subcategory $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda') \subset \mathcal{C}$ spanned by $L(\lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda'$. This is a highest weight subcategory with respect to the standards $\Delta(\lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda'$. For two such subsets $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda''$ we can form the quotient category $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda'')/\mathcal{C}(\Lambda')$ that is also a highest weight category, the standards are the images of $\Delta(\lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda'' \setminus \Lambda'$.

Set $\Lambda' := \Lambda_{<}^a, \Lambda'' := \Lambda_{<}^a \sqcup \underline{\Lambda}_+^a$. In [L2, 5.3] we have equipped the highest weight category $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{a}} := \mathcal{C}(\Lambda'')/\mathcal{C}(\Lambda')$ with a highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification structure (with respect to the hierarchy structure on $\underline{\Lambda}_+^a$). Namely, the functor E preserves both $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda'), \mathcal{C}(\Lambda'')$ and so induces an exact functor E_- on $\mathcal{C}_{\underline{a}}$. It turns out that there is a biadjoint functor F_- to E_- that provides a categorification structure.

Using a categorical splitting construction in [L2, 5.4] we have established a certain increasing filtration on $\mathcal{C}$ with filtration subcategories of the form $\mathcal{C}(\Lambda')$. Subsequent quotients of this filtration are so called basic categorifications. These are simplest possible highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications. A highest weight poset of a basic categorification is $\{+, -\}^n$ and the order defined as above. There is only one family and the map σ is the identity. Also there is only one possible splitting structure and only one possible hierarchy structure on $\{+, -\}^n$.

Now let us proceed to crystals of highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications.

In [L1] we have determined crystal structures for highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications. Let us recall the general construction of the crystal of an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification, essentially due to Chuang and Rouquier. The crystal structure is on the set of isomorphism classes of simple objects. For a simple L the object EL has simple head (the maximal semisimple quotient) and socle (the maximal semisimple subobject) and they are isomorphic. The same is true for FL . By definition, $\tilde{e}L$ (resp., $\tilde{f}L$) is the socle of EL , resp., FL , if that object is nonzero or zero else. Of course, for a highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification the set of iso-classes of simples is naturally identified with the highest weight poset Λ .

Also we have a crystal structure on $\{+, -\}^n$ defined using the “usual” cancelation rule for $+$ ’s and $-$ ’s, see Subsection 2.3. The main result of [L1] is that, for a highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification $\mathcal{C}$ with poset Λ , each family Λ_a is a subcrystal (which is easy), and each map σ_a is an isomorphism of crystals (which is harder).

A corollary of the previous paragraph is that the crystal of the $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -categorification on $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}$ is the same as the usual crystal described in Subsection 2.3. The crystal structure on $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^{\mathbf{p}}$ is obtained in a similar way, if we replace the usual multipartitions with virtual ones.

We will need more structural results about highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications. First, we need some information about Ext 's between simples and costandards.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification and Λ_a be a family. For $t, s \in \{+, -\}^{n_a}$ we have $\text{Ext}^1(L(\sigma_a(t)), \nabla(\sigma_a(s))) \neq 0$ if and only if s is obtained from t by switching the elements in a marked pair.*

Proof. Replacing $\mathcal{C}$ with $\mathcal{C}^{opp}$, we can deal with $\text{Ext}^1(\Delta(\sigma_a(s)), L(\sigma_a(t)))$. The non-vanishing of the latter just means that $P(\sigma_a(t))$ appears in the degree 1 part of a minimal projective resolution of $\Delta(\sigma_a(s))$. Now our claim follows from [L2, Proposition 6.6]. $\square$

Finally, we will need some information on the structure of $ET(\lambda)$ and $FT(\lambda)$ obtained in [L2, Proposition 7.1]. Namely, let $\tilde{e}^*\lambda, \tilde{f}^*\lambda$ denote the images of λ under the dual crystal operators, by definition, $\tilde{e}^*\lambda = \sigma_a(\tilde{e}^*\sigma_a^{-1}(\lambda))$, where $\tilde{e}^*$ is defined by using the “dual” cancellation rules from Subsection 2.3, and $\tilde{f}^*\lambda$ is defined in a similar fashion. The following is a direct corollary of [L2, Proposition 7.1].

Lemma 4.2. *$T(\tilde{e}^*\lambda)$ is a direct summand of $ET(\lambda)$ and $T(\tilde{f}^*\lambda)$ is a direct sum of $FT(\lambda)$.*

5. TRUNCATED PARABOLIC AFFINE CATEGORIFICATION

5.1. Categorification functors on $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$. Recall the truncated category $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n) \subset \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p$. Also recall that the functor E_i sends $\Delta(\lambda), \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ to a filtered object, whose successive filtration quotients are standards labeled by virtual multipartitions obtained from λ by removing an i -box.

Below we always assume that $n < s_i$ for all i . Let λ be a genuine multipartition. Then removing an i -box with $i \neq 0$ from λ we still get a genuine multipartition. So E_i preserves $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ if $i \neq 0$. However, E_0 does not. Indeed, the set of removable boxes of the virtual multipartition $\tilde{\lambda}$ corresponding to λ consists of the removable boxes of λ together with the ℓ boxes $(0, s_i, i), i = 1, \dots, \ell$. All these ℓ boxes are 0-boxes. These are the smallest ℓ removable boxes in the virtual multipartition. The functor E_0 can remove one of these ℓ boxes and so ℓ standard subquotients in a filtration of $E_0\Delta(\lambda)$ do not belong to $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$.

Let Λ_1 be the set of all actual partitions $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(\ell)})$ such that $\lambda^{(i)}$ has strictly less than s_i rows. The boxes $(0, s_i, i), i = 1, \dots, \ell$ are still the smallest removable 0-boxes of the corresponding multipartition $\tilde{\lambda}$. We claim that Λ_1 is one of the posets of the form $\Lambda(\mathfrak{A}')$ appearing in the hierarchy (with the ℓ -boxes frozen). Namely, it is obtained by doing the ℓ iterations of the transformation $\Lambda \mapsto \underline{\Lambda}^a$, where each time a is the index for a family containing $\tilde{\lambda}$ (this will freeze precisely the ℓ boxes $(0, s_i, i)$).

Let $\mathcal{C}_1$ be the highest weight subquotient category of $\mathcal{C}$ corresponding to Λ_1 so that $\mathcal{O}_e^p(\leq n)$ embeds into $\mathcal{C}_1$ as a highest weight subcategory. Now the categorical splitting construction recalled in Subsection 4.3 (applied ℓ times) equips $\mathcal{C}_1$ with a structure of a highest weight categorification with respect to the induced hierarchy structure on Λ_1 . Let us remark that $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ embeds into $\mathcal{C}_1$ as a highest weight subcategory. In particular, we get a truncated functor E_0 on $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ that now preserves the subcategory.

So now we have functors $E_i : \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j-1), i = 0, \dots, e-1$ defined for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ (we set $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(-1) = 0$) and also functors $F_i : \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j+1)$ defined for $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. All biadjointness properties between E_i, F_i still hold. For $i \neq 0$ these properties holds because of the embedding $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p$ and for $i = 0$ – because of the embedding $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}_1$. Also the embedding $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ produces

natural transformations X of $F := \bigoplus_{i=0}^{e-1} F_i : \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j+1)$ (for $j < n$) and T of $F^2 : \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(j+2)$ (for $j < n-1$) that satisfy the Hecke relations.

So the structure on $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ that we get is almost that of an $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -categorification with the difference that a genuine categorification would categorify the whole Fock space, while $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ categorifies just the sum of graded components with degrees from 0 to n . We will call such a structure a *restricted categorification*.

We remark that all results mentioned in Subsection 4.3 hold for $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ in the following sense. First, one can still define the (restricted) crystal for $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ as before. The crystal coincides with the restriction of the crystal for $\mathcal{P}_\ell$. The reason is that for $i \neq 0$ the operators $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$ are induced from $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p$, while for $i = 0$ they are induced from $\mathcal{C}_1$. Also let Λ_a be an i -family contained in $\mathcal{P}_\ell(n)$. Thanks to the embeddings $\mathcal{O}_e^p(\leq n) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p, \mathcal{C}_1$, Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 still hold.

5.2. $F^n \Delta(\emptyset)$. In this subsection we are going to investigate the structure of the object $F^n \Delta(\emptyset)$. First of all, let us observe that the transformations X, T of F, F^2 that are a part of the categorification structure on $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p$ give rise to a homomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^q(n) \rightarrow \text{End}(F^n \Delta(\emptyset))^{opp}$.

The main result is the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume as before that $n < s_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Then the following claims hold:*

- (1) $F^j \tilde{\Delta}(\emptyset)$ is a projective object in $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^p$.
- (2) The homomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^q(j) \rightarrow \text{End}(F^j \Delta(\emptyset))^{opp}$ factors through an isomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_s^q(j)$.

We remark that a different proof of (2) was recently obtained by Shan, Varagnolo and Vasserot.

Proof. To show that the homomorphism $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^q(n) \rightarrow \text{End}(F^n \Delta(\emptyset))^{opp}$ factors through $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_s^q(n)$ it is enough to consider the case of $j = 1$. In this case the claim follows from the form of the successive quotients of the filtration on $F \Delta(\emptyset)$, see Subsection 4.2.

We can view $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^p(\leq n)$ as a flat formal 1-parametric deformation of $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$. The object $F^j \tilde{\Delta}(\emptyset)$ is flat. Therefore it is enough to prove all the other claims after the reduction modulo $\hbar$.

The claim that $F^j \Delta(\emptyset)$ is projective follows from the observation that $\Delta(\emptyset)$ and that F admits a biadjoint functor, the functor $E_0 \oplus E_1 \oplus \dots \oplus E_{e-1}$ from the previous subsection.

So it remains to show that $\mathcal{H}_s^q(j) \rightarrow \text{End}(F^j \Delta(\emptyset))^{opp}$ is an isomorphism. Let $\mathcal{L}^s$ be Rouquier's irreducible $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -categorification with highest weight $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \Lambda_{s_i}$, see [R2, 5.1.2]. It has a natural grading $\mathcal{L}^s = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}^s(i)$ according to the degree. Let $\mathbf{1}_s$ be the indecomposable object in $\mathcal{L}^s(0)$. Despite the fact that our categorification $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ is restricted, Rouquier's construction in [R2, 5.1.2] still works and produces a unique morphism of restricted categorifications $\bigoplus_{i=0}^n \mathcal{L}^s(i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ that maps $\mathbf{1}_s$ to $\Delta(\emptyset)$. The proof of [R2, Lemma 5.4] carries to our situation verbatim and implies that the functor $\bigoplus_{i=0}^n \mathcal{L}^s(i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$ is fully faithful. So the homomorphism $\mathcal{H}_q^s(j) \rightarrow \text{End}(F^j \Delta_0)$ is the composition of $\mathcal{H}_q^s(j) \rightarrow \text{End}(F^j \mathbf{1}_s)^{opp}$ and the isomorphism $\text{End}(F^j \mathbf{1}_s) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{End}(F^j \Delta(\emptyset))$. But, thanks to [R2, 5.3.7, 5.3.8], the homomorphism $\mathcal{H}_q^s(j) \rightarrow \text{End}(F^j \mathbf{1}_s)^{opp}$ is an isomorphism. $\square$

Let us specify the indecomposable summands of $F^j \Delta(\lambda)$ in $\mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq n)$. The same description is true for $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}$.

Proposition 5.2. *For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(j)$, an indecomposable projective $P(\lambda)$ appears in $F^j\Delta(\emptyset)$ if and only if λ lies in the connected component $\mathcal{P}_\ell^0$ of $\emptyset$ in the crystal of $\mathcal{P}_\ell$.*

Proof. $P(\lambda)$ appears in $F^j\Delta_0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}(F^j\Delta_0, L(\lambda)) \neq 0$ if and only if $E^j L(\lambda) \neq 0$. If $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\ell^0$, then $E^j L(\lambda) \neq 0$. To see that $E^j L(\lambda) = 0$ for $\lambda \notin \mathcal{P}_\ell^0$ we notice that $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ (resp., $\mathcal{P}_\ell^0$) is the crystal of the Fock space $\mathcal{F}_s$ (resp., the irreducible $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -module with highest weight $\sum_{i=1}^\ell \omega_{s_i}$). All singular vectors in $\mathcal{F}_s$ different from the vacuum vector v_0 lie in the positive degree components. Let $\mathcal{F}'_s$ be the graded $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -stable complement to the top irreducible in $\mathcal{F}'_s$. Then all elements in $\mathcal{F}'_s(j)$ are annihilated by $e^j = (e_0 + \dots + e_{e-1})^j$. For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(j) \setminus \mathcal{P}_\ell^0$ we have $[L(\lambda)] \in \mathcal{F}'_s(j)$. Hence $[E^j L(\lambda)] = e^j L(\lambda) = 0$ and $E^j L(\lambda) = 0$. $\square$

5.3. Checking (R1) and (R2). Thanks to Proposition 5.1, we have a quotient functor $\pi_h^1 : \mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^p(n) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_s^q(n)\text{-mod}$. A quotient functor $\pi_h^2 : \mathcal{O}_{\kappa, s, \mathbf{x}}(n) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_s^q(n)\text{-mod}$ has already appeared before. In this subsection we will check that these functors satisfy conditions (R1) and (R2).

After localizing by $\hbar$, the standard modules in $\mathcal{O}_{-e, \mathbf{x}}^p, \mathcal{O}_{\kappa, s, \mathbf{x}}$ become simple. Since the localizations are highest weight categories (whose standards are the localizations of the original standards), they are semisimple. Consider the action of the pairwise commuting operators $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_s^q(n)$ on $F^n\Delta(\emptyset)[\hbar^{-1}]$. We claim that these operators have the simple spectrum in the sense that they are diagonalizable and their common eigenspaces are simples. This is proved by induction on n using the computation of the eigenvalues of X on the subquotients of $F\Delta(\lambda)$ and the observation that $\exp(2\pi i(x_0\hbar - \frac{1}{e})(\text{cont}(b) + x_k\hbar)) = \exp(2\pi i(x_0\hbar - \frac{1}{e})(\text{cont}(b') + x_{k'}\hbar))$ only if $k = k', \text{cont}(b) = \text{cont}(b')$. It follows that the isotypic component of $\Delta(\lambda)$ in $F^n\Delta(\emptyset)$ is nonzero. Moreover, this component is a single eigenspace for the symmetric polynomials in $X_1, \dots, X_n$. Since that component is non-zero, the localization $\pi_h^i[\hbar^{-1}]$ is an equivalence. From the characterization in terms of eigenvalues it follows that the self-identification of $\mathcal{P}_\ell(n)$ in (R1) is the identity, which implies (R2).

6. 0-FAITHFULNESS FROM THE COMBINATORIAL CONJECTURE

Fix $n > 0$. We are working with a restricted highest weight $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -categorification $\mathcal{C}(\leq N) := \bigoplus_{j=0}^N \mathcal{C}(j)$, where $N \gg n$ (we will specify the choice of N below).

We assume that either $\mathcal{C}$ extends to a genuine $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ -categorification $\mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{C}(\leq N) = \mathcal{O}_{-e}^p(\leq N)$. In particular, the highest weight poset for $\mathcal{C}(\leq N)$ is $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq N)$.

6.1. Simple reflections and Ext's. First of all, let us check that for a singular λ the element $w\lambda$ is well-defined.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\ell$ be singular. Let $w \in \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_e$ and let $w = s_{i_k} \dots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}$ be its reduced expression. Then $\tilde{e}_{i_j}(s_{i_{j-1}} \dots s_{i_1} \lambda) = 0$.*

Proof. Consider the class $[L(\lambda)]$ of $L(\lambda) \in \mathcal{O}_{\kappa, s}$ in the Fock space $[\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, s}]$. Define an element $w[L(\lambda)]$ by applying some lifting of w in the Kac-Moody group to $[L(\lambda)]$. This element is well-defined up to a scalar factor. The operator $[E_{i_j}]$ does annihilate $s_{i_{j-1}} \dots s_{i_1}[L(\lambda)]$ because the element $[L(\lambda)]$ is singular. We claim that $[L(s_{i_j} \dots s_{i_1} \lambda)]$ is a multiple of $s_{i_j} \dots s_{i_1}[L(\lambda)]$. Now this claim together with the original claim of the lemma are proved together by induction. This is possible because the action of s_{i_j} on both $[L(s_{i_{j-1}} \dots s_{i_1} \lambda)]$ and $s_{i_{j-1}} \dots s_{i_1}[L(\lambda)]$ are given by applying the same power of $[F_{i_j}]$ (or a multiple of that operator). $\square$

The following proposition is the main result of this subsection.

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_\ell$ lie in the same block and $\tilde{e}_i \lambda = \tilde{e}_i^* \mu = 0$. Suppose further that $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq N)$ contains the whole i -families of λ, μ . Then we have $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^j(L(\lambda), T(\lambda)) = \dim \operatorname{Ext}^j(L(s_i \lambda), T(s_i^* \mu))$ for all j .*

Proof. Set $k := h_{i,+}(\lambda)$. So $s_i \lambda := \tilde{f}_i^k \lambda$ and therefore $L(s_i \lambda) = F_i^{(k)} L(\lambda)$. So $\operatorname{Ext}^j(L(s_i \lambda), T(s_i^* \mu)) = \operatorname{Ext}^j(F_i^{(k)} L(\lambda), T(s_i^* \mu)) = \operatorname{Ext}^j(L(\lambda), E_i^{(k)} T(s_i^* \mu))$. But $\mu = (\tilde{e}_i^*)^k s_i^* \mu$. Lemma 4.2 (applied k times) implies that $T(\mu) = T((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k s_i^* \mu)$ is a direct summand in $E_i^k T(s_i^* \mu)$ and hence in $E_i^{(k)} T(s_i^* \mu)$. Therefore $\operatorname{Ext}^j(L(\lambda), T(\lambda)) \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Ext}^j(L(s_i \lambda), T(s_i^* \mu))$. The inclusion in the opposite direction is proved analogously. $\square$

6.2. Companion elements, representation theoretically. Pick a Weyl group element w with reduced decomposition $s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_k}$. For an element λ of the form $w\tau$ with singular τ let $\tilde{L}(\lambda)$ denote the maximal quotient of $\Delta(\lambda)$ whose composition factors are of the form $w\tau'$, with some singular τ' , such that for all j the following two conditions are satisfied:

- $s_{i_j} \dots s_{i_k} \tau' < s_{i_j} \dots s_{i_k} \tau$
- the previous two elements lie in different i_{j-1} -families.

Fix a residue i and an i -family $\Lambda_a \subset \mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq N)$ containing $\lambda := w\tau$ with $l(s_i w) > l(w)$. Then $\mu := s_i w \lambda = \tilde{f}_i^{h_{i,+}(\lambda)} \lambda$ makes sense. Let $\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^k$ be all elements in $\mathcal{P}_\ell \setminus \Lambda_a$ such that $\tilde{e}_i \lambda^j = 0$, $L(\lambda^j)$ lies in the head of $\ker[\Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow \tilde{L}(\lambda)]$. We assume that the i -families containing the elements $\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^k$ are in $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq N)$ (this always can be achieved by increasing N).

Also let $\mu^1, \dots, \mu^l$ be all elements obtained from μ like in the definition of a companion element given in Subsection 2.4. Recall that we consider $s := \sigma_a^{-1}(s_i w \lambda)$. Pick all marked pairs $p_1, \dots, p_l$ in $\{1, \dots, n_a\}$. Then $\mu^j := \mu[p_j]$ (see Subsection 2.4 for the definition of the right hand side).

Proposition 6.3. *If $L(\nu)$ lies in the head of $\ker[\Delta(\mu) \rightarrow \tilde{L}(\mu)]$, then ν is one of the elements $s_i \lambda^1, \dots, s_i \lambda^k, \mu^1, \dots, \mu^l$.*

In the proof we will need two auxiliary lemmas. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification with respect to a hierarchy structure on a poset Λ . Pick $d > 0$. Consider the weight components $\mathcal{C}_d, \mathcal{C}_{-d}$ and the full subcategories $\mathcal{C}'_d, \mathcal{C}'_{-d}$ of those consisting of all objects annihilated by E, F , respectively.

Lemma 6.4. *The functors $E^{(d)} : \mathcal{C}_{-d} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_d, F^{(d)} : \mathcal{C}_d \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{-d}$ map $\mathcal{C}'_{-d}$ to $\mathcal{C}'_d$ and vice versa and restrict to mutually (quasi) inverse equivalences.*

Proof. Thanks to [CR], we know that $E^{(d)}, F^{(d)}$ induce inverse maps on the sets of simples in $\mathcal{C}'_d, \mathcal{C}'_{-d}$. So they do restrict to functors between these subcategories. We have the adjointness natural transformations $\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{C}'_d} \rightarrow E^{(d)} F^{(d)}|_{\mathcal{C}'_d}, \operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{C}'_{-d}} \rightarrow F^{(d)} E^{(d)}|_{\mathcal{C}'_{-d}}$. They are isomorphisms when evaluated on simples. It follows that $E^{(d)}, F^{(d)}$ define mutually dual equivalences. $\square$

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(N)$ be such that $\tilde{f}_i \mu = 0, \tilde{f}_i \nu \neq 0$ and $L(\nu)$ lies in the head of $\ker[\Delta(\mu) \rightarrow \tilde{L}(\mu)]$. Then ν belongs to the same family as μ and is obtained from μ by switching $-$ and $+$ in a marked pair.*

Proof. It follows that $L(\tilde{f}_i \nu)$ lies in the head of $F_i \Delta(\mu)$. But all labels of the simples in that head belong to the same family as μ . Therefore $\tilde{f}_i \nu$ and hence ν belong to the same family as μ . The claim about the form of ν follows from the description of the head of $F_i \Delta(\mu)$ obtained in [L2, Proposition 6.7]. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 6.3. In the proof we may assume that $\mathcal{C}(\leq N)$ is embedded into a genuine highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorification $\mathcal{C}$ corresponding to the residue i as a highest weight subcategory.

First, we consider the case when $\nu \notin \Lambda_a$. We claim that $\nu = s_i \lambda^j$ for some j . By Lemma 6.5, $\tilde{f}_i \nu = 0$ and so $s_i \nu$ makes sense. Next, $s_i \nu \not\geq \lambda$ because of the family filtration. Fix an epimorphism $\ker[\Delta(\mu) \rightarrow \tilde{L}(\mu)] \twoheadrightarrow L(\nu)$. Let N_ν denote the quotient of $\Delta(\mu)$ by the kernel of that epimorphism. Clearly, N_μ has simple head, $L(\mu)$. Moreover, all simple constituents of N_μ but $L(\nu)$ are of the form $L(s_i w \tau')$ for singular τ' . In particular, N_μ is annihilated by F_i . Let $N_\lambda := E^{(h_i, -(\mu))} N_\mu$. Thanks to Lemma 6.4, the module N_λ has simple head, $L(\lambda)$, $L(s_i \nu)$ in the socle, while all other constituents are of the form $L(w \tau')$. Consider the Serre subcategory generated by $L(\zeta)$ with $\zeta \leq \lambda$. Then $\Delta(\lambda)$ is a projective in this subcategory, and N_λ is an object there. So the projection $\Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow L(\lambda)$ factors through $\Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow N_\lambda$. Since N_λ has simple head, we see that $\Delta(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow N_\lambda$. From the choice of ν and the construction of $\tilde{L}(\lambda)$, we see that $L(s_i \nu)$ projects trivially to $\tilde{L}(\lambda)$ and so lies in the head of $\ker[\Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow \tilde{L}(\lambda)]$.

Now consider the case when $\nu \in \Lambda_a$. In the subquotient category corresponding to Λ_a , the simple $L(\nu)$ lies in the head of $\Delta(\mu) \rightarrow L(\mu)$. Applying Lemma 4.1, we see that ν is one of the elements $\mu^1, \dots, \mu^k$. $\square$

Now we can explain a representation theoretic meaning of companion elements.

Corollary 6.6. *Let λ be a singular element in $\mathcal{P}_\ell(n)$ and $w \in \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_e$. Fix a reduced expression $w = s_{i_k} \dots s_{i_1}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq N)$ contains the whole i_j -family of $s_{i_{j-1}} \dots s_{i_1} \lambda'$, for any singular λ' with $|\lambda'| = |\lambda|$ and any j . Further, let $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(n)$ be such that $L(\nu)$ lies in the head of $\ker[\Delta(w\lambda) \rightarrow \tilde{L}(w\lambda)]$. Then ν is a companion element of $w\lambda$ (associated to the fixed reduced expression of w).*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $l(w)$. The induction step is provided by Proposition 6.3. The base of induction is $w = 1$. Here $\tilde{L}(\lambda)$ is just the maximal quotient of $\Delta(\lambda)$ annihilated by all E_i . The straightforward analog of Lemma 6.5 (for E_i instead of F_i) shows that ν is obtained from λ by switching a box in a marked pair and so is a companion of λ . $\square$

6.3. Completing the proof of 0-faithfulness. Recall that we have fixed a positive integer n . We are going to prove (modulo Conjecture 2.4) that $\text{Ext}^i(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) = 0$ for all $i = 0, 1$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(n')$ that does not lie in the crystal component of $\emptyset$ and any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_\ell(n')$ (here we work with the category $\mathcal{C}(\leq N)$) for any $n' \leq n$. This shows that the quotient functor corresponding to the projectives $P(\nu)$, where ν lies in the crystal component of $\emptyset$ is 0-faithful, compare with [R1, 4.2]. By the construction of Subsection 5.2, the functor π^1 is such a quotient functor.

Let us explain the choice of N . Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_q$ be all singular and cosingular elements in $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq n)$. For each pair λ_i, μ_j we can find an element $w_{ij} \in \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_e$ such that Conjecture 2.4 holds for w_{ij} . Set $N_1 := \max_{i,j} |w_{ij} \lambda_i|$. The number of addable boxes in an ℓ -multipartition of N_1 does not exceed $N_1 + \ell$. We can take any $N \geq 2N_1 + \ell$. The set $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq N)$ contains all multipartitions in $\mathcal{P}_\ell(\leq N_1)$ together with all families containing these multipartitions.

So we need to prove the Ext vanishing. The first step will be to reduce the proof to the case when λ is singular, while μ is cosingular. We can assume that the Ext vanishing is already proved for all $n' < n$ (the base of induction is $n = 0$, where the claim is vacuous).

First, suppose λ is not singular: there is a residue i such that $\lambda' := \tilde{e}_i \lambda \neq 0$. Consider the morphism $F_i L(\lambda') \twoheadrightarrow L(\lambda)$ and let K be its kernel. Then $\text{Hom}(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}(F_i L(\lambda'), T(\mu)) = \text{Hom}(L(\lambda'), E_i T(\mu))$. The object $E_i T(\mu)$ is tilting and so, by the inductive assumption, $\text{Hom}(L(\lambda'), E_i T(\mu))$ is zero and hence $\text{Hom}(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) = 0$.

Also we have the short exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}(K, T(\mu)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(F_i L(\lambda'), T(\mu))$$

The right term is zero, as above. Let us show that the left term is zero as well. We remark that $E^n K = E^n F_i L(\lambda') = 0$ because λ' does not lie in the crystal component of $\emptyset$, compare with the proof of Proposition 5.2. So all simple constituents of K do not lie in the crystal component of $\emptyset$. So, by what has been already proved, $\text{Hom}(K, T(\mu)) = 0$. It follows that $\text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) = 0$ and we are done: we can assume that λ is singular.

Let us now show that $\text{Ext}^i(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) = 0$ for all i if μ is not cosingular. Assume that there is i such that $\mu' := \tilde{e}_i^* \mu \neq 0$. Then, by Lemma 4.2, $T(\mu)$ is a direct summand of $F_i T(\mu')$ and hence $\text{Ext}^i(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) \hookrightarrow \text{Ext}^i(L(\lambda), F_i T(\mu')) = \text{Ext}^i(E_i L(\lambda), T(\mu')) = 0$.

So now we can assume that $\lambda = \lambda_i$ is singular, while $\mu = \mu_j$ is cosingular. Set $\hat{\lambda} = w_{ij} \lambda$, $\hat{\mu} := w_{ij}^* \mu$. Proposition 6.2 implies that $\dim \text{Ext}^j(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) = \dim \text{Ext}^j(L(\hat{\lambda}), T(\hat{\mu}))$ for all j . Since $\hat{\lambda} \not\leq \hat{\mu}$, we see that $\text{Hom}(L(\hat{\lambda}), T(\hat{\mu})) = 0$.

Let us show that Ext^1 vanishes as well. Let $K := \ker[\Delta(\hat{\lambda}) \rightarrow \tilde{L}(\hat{\lambda})]$. By Corollary 6.6, if $L(\nu) \subset \text{head}(K)$, then ν is a companion of $\hat{\lambda}$. In particular, $\nu \not\leq \hat{\mu}$. So $L(\nu)$ is not a constituent of $T(\hat{\mu})$. It follows that $\text{Hom}(K, T(\hat{\mu})) = 0$. Also $\text{Ext}^1(\Delta(\hat{\lambda}), T(\hat{\mu})) = 0$ by the defining property of a tilting object. From the exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}(K, T(\hat{\mu})) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\tilde{L}(\hat{\lambda}), T(\hat{\mu})) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\Delta(\hat{\lambda}), T(\hat{\mu}))$$

we deduce that $\text{Ext}^1(\tilde{L}(\hat{\lambda}), T(\hat{\mu})) = 0$. Let $\tilde{L}_0$ be the kernel of $\tilde{L}(\hat{\lambda}) \twoheadrightarrow L(\lambda)$. The simple constituents of $\tilde{L}_0$ are of the form $w_{ij} \lambda'$, where λ' is singular. So, by the above, $\text{Hom}(\tilde{L}_0, T(\hat{\mu})) = 0$. It follows that $\text{Ext}^1(L(\hat{\lambda}), T(\hat{\mu})) = 0$.

So we see that $\text{Ext}^j(L(\lambda), T(\mu)) = \text{Ext}^j(L(\hat{\lambda}), T(\hat{\mu})) = 0$ for $j = 0, 1$. The proof of the 0-faithfulness is complete.

7. PROOF OF THE COMBINATORIAL CONJECTURE IN THE DOMINANT CASE

7.1. Level 1. Here our only restriction is that $e > 2$.

Singular diagrams are $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$ such that each λ_j is divisible by e . Cosingular diagrams are transpose to singular ones. In other words, μ is cosingular if the multiplicity of each part in μ is divisible by e .

We will work with the cycle $w = C_{j,n} = s_{j-n+1} \dots s_{j-1} s_j$. We will explicitly compute $w\lambda, w^* \mu$ and also the companion elements of $w\lambda$. From these computations we will deduce Conjecture 2.4.

A crucial observation for our computation (which is no longer true for $\ell > 1$) is that all crystal components of $\mathcal{P}$ are isomorphic to the component of $\emptyset$ via a very easy isomorphism. Namely, for a singular partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$ let $\mathcal{P}^\lambda$ denote its connected component in the crystal. The following is well-known.

Lemma 7.1. *The map $\mathcal{P}^\emptyset \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\lambda$ that sends $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d)$ to $(\mu_1 + \lambda_1, \dots, \mu_d + \lambda_d)$ is an isomorphism of crystals.*

As a corollary of this lemma, we get the formulas for $C_{j,n}\lambda$ and $C_{j,n}^*\mu$. We assume that $s_1 = 0$ and so the residue of the box $(1, 1)$ is 0. Also we assume that $j = 0$. We introduce partitions ν_n : by definition, $\nu_n = (n, n - (e - 1), n - 2(e - 1), \dots)^t$. For two partitions λ^1, λ^2 we write $\lambda^1 + \lambda^2$ for their componentwise sum, $\lambda^1 + \lambda^2 = (\lambda_1^1 + \lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^1 + \lambda_2^2, \dots)$.

Corollary 7.2. *We have $C_{0,n}\lambda = \lambda + \nu_n$ and $C_{0,n}^*\mu = (\mu^t + \nu_n^t)^t$.*

Proof. The proof for the usual crystal structure boils down to the case $\lambda = \emptyset$, thanks to Lemma 7.1. The proof that $C_{0,n}\emptyset = \nu_n$ is by induction on n , for the induction step we need to notice that each time we apply s_j , there are no removable j -boxes. As for the dual crystal structure we notice that $C_{0,n}^*\mu = (C_{0,n}^\vee \mu^t)^t$, where $C_{0,n}^\vee = s_{n-1} \dots s_1 s_0$. Then $C_{0,n}^\vee \emptyset = \nu_n^t$ for the same reason as above. The proof of $C_{0,n}^*\mu = (\mu^t + \nu_n^t)^t$ reduces to the case $\mu = \emptyset$ exactly as with the usual crystal structure. $\square$

For large n (namely, for $n \geq \lambda_1^t$) the diagram $C_{0,n}\lambda$ has exactly n rows. However, $C_{0,n}^*\mu$ has $\mu_1^t + n$ rows. It follows that $C_{0,n}^*\mu \prec C_{0,n}\lambda$, which proves Conjecture 2.3 (and we do not need the restriction of $e > 2$, just $e > 1$).

To prove Conjecture 2.4 we need to analyze the structure of the companion elements. This basically occupies the remainder of this subsection.

The proof of the following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 7.3. *Let i be a residue mod e and $n > 0$. Then the marked pairs of i -boxes in $C_{0,n}\lambda$ are precisely the following: the removable i -box originally contained in λ lying in the row with number $\geq n$ and the addable box lying in the next row.*

In particular, the lemma shows that for a large enough n there are no marked pairs in λ . Actually all boxes with given residue will be either addable (if the residue is n) or removable (if the residue is $n - 1$). One checks by induction that all companion elements of $C_{0,n}\lambda$ are obtained from $C_{0,n}\lambda$ by moving either one or two boxes from some row to the row just above it. This and the formula for $C_{0,n}^*\mu$ shows that, for large enough n (it is enough to take $n > \lambda_1^t$), the partition $C_{0,n}^*\mu$ is bigger than all companions of $C_{0,n}\lambda$. Conjecture 2.4 is now proved for $\ell = 1$.

7.2. Weak conjecture in the dominant case. Starting from this subsection we consider the situation when $\ell > 1$. Fix $n > 0$. We suppose that $s_i - s_{i+1} \geq n$ for all i . Recall also that we assume $e > 2$ and $s_i - s_j$ not divisible by e for different i, j . In fact, under these conditions (we call them the dominance conditions), the argument of Rouquier, [R1, Section 6], implies that the category $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}(n)$ depends only on the residues of the s_i 's modulo e . So we will assume that $s_1 \gg s_2 \dots \gg s_\ell$ and, moreover, that $s_1 - s_2 \gg s_2 - s_3 \gg \dots \gg s_{\ell-1} - s_\ell$. Equivalences from [GL] will then allow to deal with the different orders (but still under the dominance condition). We remark that in this case the character formulas for $\mathcal{O}_{\kappa, \mathbf{s}}$ also follow from the work of Stroppel and Webster, [SW].

In this subsection we are going to prove Conjecture 2.3 under the assumptions of the previous paragraph. We claim that an element of the form $C_{a,N}$ works for a suitable N (depending on $n, s_1, \dots, s_\ell$) and a suitable a (depending on λ and μ).

First, we need a stabilization result.

Lemma 7.4. *Assume that $s_1, \dots, s_\ell$ satisfy the conditions in the beginning of the subsection. There is N_0 (depending on n) with the property that, for any $N \geq N_0$, there are no removable $a - N$ -boxes and no addable $a + 1 - N$ -boxes in $C_{a,N}\lambda$ and $C_{a,N}^*\mu$.*

Proof. We will give the proof for $C_{a,N}\lambda$, $C_{a,N}^*\mu$ is similar. Let j be the number between 0 and $e - 1$ that is equal $\lambda_1^{(1)} + s_1 + a$ modulo e . Then on the j th step we add the box with coordinates $(\lambda_1^{(1)} + 1, 1, 1)$. On the next step we put a box one position above. Let d_1 be the height of the rightmost initial column of $\lambda^{(1)}$. On step $j + d_1$ we put a box in position $(\lambda_1^{(1)} + 1, d_1, 1)$. At this point the box with coordinates $(\lambda_1^{(1)}, d, 1)$ stops being removable. Also on step $j + e - 1$ we put a box in position $(\lambda_1^{(1)} + 2, 1, 1)$.

If, on some step after that, we do not add a box to the $\lambda_1^{(1)} + 1$ th column, then the highest (at that moment) box in that column stops being removable after at most $e - 1$ steps and so never forms a marked pairs. So we do not have marked pairs involving boxes lying in columns with numbers $> \lambda_1^{(1)}$ in the first diagram. In particular, any addable box lying in the $\lambda_1^{(1)}$ th column never enters a marked pair and so always can be added on an appropriate step.

Let us show that after a certain step there will be no removable $a - N$ -box in the $\lambda_1^{(1)}$ th column. Let d_2 be the differences between the height of $\lambda_1^{(1)}$ th and $\lambda_1^{(1)} + 1$ th column on step $j + d_1$. If, on some step, we have a removable box in $\lambda_1^{(1)}$ th that is not blocked on the next step by a box directly above, then after e steps the difference of heights of the $\lambda_1^{(1)}$ th and $\lambda_1^{(1)} + 1$ th columns becomes less by e . So eventually that removable box will be blocked by a box directly on the right. After that we will not have removable $a - N$ -boxes in the $\lambda_1^{(1)}$ th column of $C_{a,N}\lambda$ for the same reason as in the previous paragraph. Also at that point there will be no addable $a + 1 - N$ -boxes in columns with numbers $\geq \lambda_1^{(1)}$.

Arguing in this way we see that for N bigger than some $N_{0,1}$ there are no addable $a + 1 - N$ -boxes and no removable $a - N$ -boxes in the first diagram. Then we can apply the same argument to the second diagram. Our conclusion is that there is $N_{0,2}$ such that for $N > N_{0,2}$ there are no boxes as in the statement of the lemma in both the first and the second diagrams. Continuing in this way, we prove the lemma. $\square$

Let λ be a singular ℓ -multipartition. Then clearly $(\lambda^{(k)}, \dots, \lambda^{(\ell)})$ is a singular $\ell - k + 1$ -multipartition for the multi-charge $s_k, \dots, s_\ell$. In particular, $\lambda^{(\ell)}$ is divisible by e . Let r be the minimal index such that $\lambda^{(r)}, \dots, \lambda^{(\ell)}$ are all divisible by e .

To proceed further we need some terminology. We say that $C_{a,N}\lambda$ is obstructed in the j th diagram, where we take $j \geq r$, if there is a marked pair with residue $a - N$ and addable box in the j th diagram. If $C_{a,N}\lambda$ is obstructed in the j th diagram, then $(C_{a,N+1}\lambda)^{(j)}$ is different from $C_{a,N+1}(\lambda^{(j)})$. Here and below, when we write expressions like $C_{a,N+1}(\lambda^{(j)})$ we take into account the shift of content in $\lambda^{(j)}$.

Let $\ell_a(\lambda)$ be the largest number such that the $\ell(\lambda)$ th diagram becomes obstructed in some $C_{a,N}\lambda$.

The following lemma is a crucial part of the proof of Conjecture 2.3.

Lemma 7.5. *Assume that N_1 is such that $C_{a,N_1}\lambda$ is obstructed in $q := \ell_a(\lambda)$ th diagram. For N large enough, $s_{a-N+1} \dots s_{a-N_1}\lambda'$ is contained in $\lambda^{(j)} + C_{a,N}^\vee \emptyset$. Moreover, the difference contains at least e boxes such that $c_N + N$ is constant for N large enough. Here c_N is the maximum of the contents of these boxes.*

Proof. We may assume that $\lambda^{(j)} = \emptyset$ for $j \geq q$ thanks to an isomorphism of crystals. The containment here is proved by an easy induction on N . Set $\lambda' := C_{a,N_1}\lambda$. Either the first column of $(s_{a-N+1} \dots s_{a-N_1}\lambda')^{(j)}$ coincides with the first column of $C_{a,N}^\vee \emptyset$ or has at least

e less elements. This is because e turns pass between consecutive insertions of boxes with fixed residues. If the second option takes place, then we are done. Otherwise the behavior of the remaining columns of the j th diagram is independent of the first one. Therefore we can repeat the argument with the second column and so on. $\square$

Now we are ready to conclude the proof of Conjecture 2.3. First, assume that $\mu^{(j)} \neq \emptyset$ for some $j \geq r$. Choose the maximal j with this property. Let a be the smallest shifted content of an addable box in $\mu^{(j)}$. It is easy to see that $(C_{a,N}^* \mu)^{(k)}$ coincides with $C_{a,N} \emptyset^{(k)}$ for $k > j$, while the first column of $(C_{a,N}^* \mu)^{(j)}$ has $(\mu^{(j)})_1^t + n$ boxes. On the other hand, by Lemma 7.5, $(C_{a,N} \lambda)^{(k)}$ is contained in $\lambda^{(k)} + C_{a,N}(\emptyset^{(k)})$ for $k \geq j$. So there is an integer d with the following property: for all N bigger than some fixed number N_2 all (shifted) contents of the boxes in $(C_{a,N} \lambda)^{(k)} \setminus (C_{a,N}^* \mu)^{(k)}$ is bigger than d for all $k \geq j$, while $(C_{a,N}^* \mu)^{(j)} \setminus (C_{a,N} \lambda)^{(j)}$ contains a box with content less than d . On the other hand, recall the condition $s_1 - s_2 \gg s_2 - s_3 \gg \dots \gg s_{\ell-1} - s_\ell$. It implies that there is $N'_2 \gg N_2$ such that all boxes in $(C_{a,N} \lambda)^{(k)}, (C_{a,N}^* \mu)^{(k)}$ have contents bigger than d for $k < j$. Therefore $C_{a,N} \lambda \not\leq C_{a,N}^* \mu$ for N between N_2 and N'_2 .

So let us consider the case $\mu^{(k)} = \emptyset$ for $k \geq r$. Here, definitely, $r > 1$. Let a be the residue of the highest removable box in $\lambda^{(r-1)}$ that is not paired to an addable box in $\lambda^{(r-1)}$. It follows that $C_{a,N} \lambda$ gets obstructed even for $N = 1$. Then we can take $j = \ell_a(\lambda)$ and repeat the argument in the previous paragraph with the same conclusion.

This finishes the proof of Conjecture 2.3 in the dominant case.

REFERENCES

- [AK] S. Ariki and K. Koike, *A Hecke algebra of $(\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z}) \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$ and construction of its irreducible representations*, Adv.Math. **106** (1994), 216–243.
- [BE] R. Bezrukavnikov and P. Etingof, *Parabolic induction and restriction functors for rational Cherednik algebras*, Sel. math., New ser. **14** (2009), 397–425.
- [CR] J. Chuang and R. Rouquier, *Derived equivalences for symmetric groups and $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications*. Ann. Math. (2) **167**(2008), n.1, 245–298.
- [DG] C. Dunkl, S. Griffeth. *Generalized Jack polynomials and the representation theory of rational Cherednik algebras*. Selecta Math. **16**(2010), 791–818.
- [EFK] P. Etingof, I. Frenkel and A. Kirillov, *Lectures on Representation Theory and Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, v. 58, AMS, 1998.
- [EG] P. Etingof and V. Ginzburg. *Symplectic reflection algebras, Calogero-Moser space, and deformed Harish-Chandra homomorphism*, Invent. Math. **147** (2002), 243–348.
- [GGOR] V. Ginzburg, N. Guay, E. Opdam and R. Rouquier, *On the category $\mathcal{O}$ for rational Cherednik algebras*, Invent. Math., **154** (2003), 617–651.
- [GL] I. Gordon, I. Losev, *On category $\mathcal{O}$ for cyclotomic Rational Cherednik algebras*. arXiv:1109.2315.
- [Gr] S. Griffeth. *Orthogonal functions generalizing Jack polynomials*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362**(2010), 6131–6157.
- [JMMO] M. Jimbo, K. Misra, T. Miwa, M. Okado, *Combinatorics of representations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n)$ at $q = 0$* , Comm. Math. Phys. **136**(1991), 543–566.
- [L1] I. Losev. *Highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications I: crystals*. arXiv:1201.4493.
- [L2] I. Losev. *Highest weight $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -categorifications II: structure theory*. arXiv:1203.5545.
- [R1] R. Rouquier, *q -Schur algebras for complex reflection groups*. Mosc. Math. J. **8** (2008), 119–158.
- [R2] R. Rouquier, *2-Kac-Moody algebras*. arXiv:0812.5023.
- [S] P. Shan. *Crystals of Fock spaces and cyclotomic rational double affine Hecke algebras*. Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. **44** (2011), 147–182.
- [U] D. Uglov. *Canonical bases of higher-level q -deformed Fock spaces and Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials*, in “Physical combinatorics (Kyoto, 1999)”, pp. 249299, Birkhauser, 2000.

- [VV] M. Varagnolo and E. Vasserot, *Cyclotomic double affine Hecke algebras and affine parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$* , Adv. Math. **225** (2010), 1523–1588.
- [SW] C. Stroppel, B. Webster. *Quiver Schur algebras and q -Fock space*. arXiv:1110.1115.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY, BOSTON MA 02115 USA
E-mail address: i.loseu@neu.edu